

Military Chaplain's Review

Spring 1990

Ethics and Moral Leadership

Introduction to the Spring Issue	
The Chaplain as Moral Touchstone	Harry G. Summers, Jr.
Sex in the Forbidden Zone	Peter Rutter
Moral Leadership and the Drug War	Roger C. Welsh
	Richard C. Gardner, III
Comradeship and Sex Discrimination	Kelly M. Fitzpatrick
Modern Warfare and the Christian Conscience	Donald L. Davidson
Pastoral Stops	Thomas R. Decker
A Soldier's Love	Herman Keizer, Jr.
National Prayer Breakfast Message	James A. Baker III
The Impact of Religion on General Stonewall Jackson	Kevin Dougherty
The Transition to Peace: Rites of Passage	Timothy J. Kikkert
Passing Over Jordan: <i>In Memoriam</i>	Donald W. Gover

Book Reviews

Professional Bulletin of the US Army Chaplain Corps

This publication is approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

This medium is approved for the official dissemination of material designed to keep individuals within the Army knowledgeable of current and emerging developments within their areas of expertise for the purpose of enhancing professional development.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

CARL E. VUONO

General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

WILLIAM J. MEEHAN II

Brigadier General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

DISTRIBUTION:

Special

Military Chaplains' Review

Spring 1990



Military Chaplains' Review

Professional Bulletin of the US Army Chaplain Corps

Chief of Chaplains

Chaplain (MG) Norris L. Einertson

US Army Chaplaincy Services Support Agency

Chaplain (COL) Herman Keizer, Jr., Deputy Director

Editor

Chaplain (MAJ) Granville E. (Gene) Tyson

The Military Chaplain's Review (ISSN 0360-9693) is published quarterly for the Chief of Chaplains by the US Army Chaplaincy Services Support Agency, 1730 K St. NW, Washington, D.C., 20006-3868. This professional bulletin for all Army, Navy and Air Force chaplains is a medium for those interested in the military chaplaincy to share the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to articles having value as reference material.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the editor, *Military Chaplains' Review*, United States Army Chaplaincy Services Support Agency, Riddell Bldg., Suite 401, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006-3868. Articles should be 12 to 20 pages long; and when appropriate, carefully documented. Detailed editorial guidelines are available from the editor.

Articles appearing in this publication reflect the views of the authors and should not be interpreted as reflecting the official opinion of the Department of the Army nor of any branch, command or agency of the Department of the Army.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Send address changes to *Military Chaplains' Review*, Riddell Bldg., Suite 401, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006-3868.

Unless copyrighted, articles may be reprinted. Please credit the author and the *Military Chaplains' Review*. Distribution restriction: Approved for public release.

**Military
Chaplains’
Review**

Introduction to the Spring Issue	1
The Chaplain as Moral Touchstone Harry G. Summers, Jr.	3
Sex in the Forbidden Zone Peter Rutter	9
Moral Leadership and the Drug War Roger C. Welsh Richard C. Gardner, III	17
Comradeship and Sex Discrimination Kelly M. Fitzpatrick	27
Modern Warfare and the Christian Conscience Donald L. Davidson	35
Pastoral Stops Thomas R. Decker	43
A Soldier’s Love Herman Keizer, Jr.	51
National Prayer Breakfast Message James A. Baker III	55
The Impact of Religion on General Stonewall Jackson Kevin Dougherty	61
The Transition to Peace: Rites of Passage Timothy J. Kikkert	67
Passing Over Jordan: <i>In Memoriam</i> Donald W. Gover	75
Book Reviews	81

Change of Address

Name _____

Address _____

Old Address _____

Send to: Military Chaplains' Review

1730 K ST. NW, Suite 401

Washington DC 20006-3868

Electronic Mail addresses for the Military Chaplains' Review:

CHAPTNET: Send mail to Gene Tyson

OPTIMIS: Send to CHSA, attn: Ch Tyson

Introduction to the Spring Issue

This item recently appeared on CHAPNET for discussion: “If a combat leader cheats on his wife, thereby violating a sacred oath, will he cheat on his soldiers? If his marriage vow holds no sanctity, can we expect that he will be any more loyal to his soldiers in a tough situation?”

This renewed interest in ethics and moral leadership provides a powerful and positive challenge to the chaplaincy today. As prophets within the system, our mission has been to keep the commander informed on complex ethical concerns. The issues are legion for military operations in peacetime, but moreover in warfare. To be prepared is to be informed about the pitfalls that lie in wait for the ethically uninformed military leader. We are working with soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines who have a finer sense of discernment of moral issues than ever before.

We offer to our readers a variety of articles from the philosophical to the practical, from short story to historical sketch, all focused on different aspects of moral leadership and ethical issues. We hope this will be helpful in your own professional growth as well as useful for discussion in chaplain training sessions.

Our next issue (Summer 1990) will feature some interesting articles about ministry in combat operations in Panama, and at the Joint Readiness Training Center, and the National Training Center.

The Fall issue will focus on family life and ministry. We would like to have articles relating to youth ministry, family life, single parenting, pastoral care, and Army family policy.

For 1991, we are planning issues on medical ethics, evangelism and discipleship, preaching and worship, and the Constitution and free exercise of religion.

Thank you for your continued support of the journal and for your articles. Please keep them coming.

Chaplain (Major) Granville E. (Gene) Tyson
Editor

The Chaplain As Moral Touchstone

Harry G. Summers, Jr.

Can We Be Good Without God?

“Can We Be Good Without God?” That was the question posed by University of Massachusetts political science professor Glenn Tinder in his provocative essay in the December 1989 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. An excerpt from his new book, *The Political Meaning of Christianity* (Louisiana State University Press), Professor Tinder argues that “the notion that we can be related to God and not to the world—that we can practice a spirituality that is not political—is in conflict with the Christian [and the Judeo and the Islamic] understanding of God.”

“And if spirituality is properly political,” he goes on to say, “the converse if also true, however distant it may be from prevailing assumptions: politics is properly spiritual. . . . Only in modern times has it come to be taken for granted that politics is entirely secular. The inevitable result is the demoralization of politics. Politics loses its moral structure and purpose, and turns into an affair of group interest and personal ambition.”

“We cannot give up the Christian God—and the transcendence given other names in other faiths—and go on as before,” Professor Tinder argues. “We must give up Christian morality too. If the God-man is nothing more than an illusion, the same is true of the idea that every individual possesses incalculable worth. . . . There is much room for argument about these matters,” he admits. “But there is no greater error in the modern mind than the assumption that the God-man can be repudiated with impunity.”¹

Standing up for the “God-man” is obviously what the military chaplaincy is all about. Every soldier knows—or should know—that the chaplain is the touchstone for not only his spiritual needs but for his moral needs as well. It is instructive that in the aftermath of the rape and murder of

¹Glenn Turner, “Can We Be Good Without God,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, December 1989, pages 69–85.

Twice wounded in action and twice decorated for valor, Colonel Summers is an infantry combat veteran of the Korean and Vietnam wars. Now a syndicated columnist for the *Los Angeles Times* and editor of *Vietnam* magazine, he formerly held the General Douglas MacArthur Chair at the Army War College.

a Vietnamese girl, Phan Thi Mao, by troopers of the 1st Cavalry Division in November 1966, portrayed in the movie "Casualties of War," that it is a divisional chaplain, Captain Gerald Kirk, a Mormon minister from Ogden, Utah, to whom the prime witness turns for help after he perceives that his company commander may be covering up the crime. "He felt he was on the right track," wrote *New Yorker* reporter Daniel Lang in his factual account of that incident, "since chaplains were professionally concerned with conscience."²

Important as that ministry to the individual soldier is, and it is very important, the Chaplain's Corps serves the nation in an even more profound way as well—as the moral touchstone which bridges the military's spiritual and political dimensions. The very motto of the Army Chaplains Corps, "Pro Deo et Patria," captures Tinder's arguments precisely. His comments on spirituality (Deo) and politics (Patria) have immediate military applicability. As the Army's basic field manual, FM 100-1, *The Army*, emphasizes, "military forces are instruments of political purpose [and] such limitations as are inherent or implied in political purposes must also be reflected in military missions and tasks."

Idealism

Not the least of the fundamental limitations "inherent or implied" in America's political purposes are those imposed by the three character traits which have traditionally shaped American foreign and military policy: non-interventionism, pragmatism and idealism. These traits wax and wane—non-interventionism, for example, is once again coming back into vogue after a fifty year hiatus—but they have always had their influence. Idealism in particular—American's perceptions of right and wrong derived almost entirely from our Judeo-Christian heritage—has always played a major role in American military affairs.

Consider this commentary from a 1936 Army Command & General Staff School manual on the principles of strategy: "An air raid which involves in its accomplishment the wholesale destruction of noncombatants can not be justified or condoned. Any nation employing such methods will be condemned by the civilized world."³

Or consider these remarks from the 1951 Senate hearings on the conduct of the Korean war:

The policy of the United States in Korea . . . is that of destroying the effective core of the Communist Chinese armies by killing that government's trained soldiers, in the hope that someone will negotiate. We hold that such a policy is essentially immoral, not likely to produce either victory in Korea or an end to aggression. At the same time such a policy tends to destroy the moral stature of the United States as a leader in the family of nations. . . .

American policy, in every war in which this country has been engaged, has been designed to win the conflict at the very earliest possible moment with

²Daniel Lang, *Casualties of War* (New York: Pocketbooks, 1989) pages 72-77. This material originally appeared in the October 18, 1969 issue of *The New Yorker*.

³*The Principles of Strategy for an Independent Corps or Army in a Theater of Operations* (Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: The Command and General Staff School Press, 1936) page 18.

the least possible loss of human life—especially American life, but also the lives of those who oppose us.⁴

These idealistic statements of policy may not have held entirely—air raids against cities became commonplace in World War II, and attrition of enemy strength was the cornerstone of our Vietnam strategy—but they had and still have their effect. Enemy propaganda notwithstanding, Hanoi was never carpet bombed during the Vietnam war⁵ and U.S. attrition strategy has been roundly condemned by both military and civilian critics of the war⁶ . . . And at the most destructive level of warfare, idealism proved to be an absolute constraint.

In Hanoi as a negotiator on the POW/MIA issue in April 1975, a week before the fall of Saigon, my North Vietnamese (NVA) Army counterpart was crowing about their imminent victory. “This just goes to show you can’t stamp out a revolutionary idea with force,” he said.

“That’s nonsense and you know it,” I replied. “Genghis Khan didn’t have any problem stamping out a revolutionary idea with force when a jihad was declared against him in Central Asia. He just killed some 13 million Moslems and turned the area into a howling desert for the next 700 years. And go to southern France today and you’d be hard pressed to find anyone who could repeat the Albigenian creed. When the heresy was suppressed in the 13th Century the military commander reputedly turned to the Bishop accompanying his expedition and asked, ‘How can you tell the heretics from the true believers?’ The terrible reply was ‘Kill them all! God will know his own.’ You know that with nuclear weapons we had the means to totally destroy you anytime we chose to do so.”

The NVA Colonel dismissed my remarks with a wave of his hand. “We knew that,” he said. “We also knew you’d never do it.”⁷

He was absolutely right. But why was he right? Not because we didn’t have the capability to do so. With our nuclear bombs and missiles we had the physical capability to obliterate North Vietnam a hundred times over. The constraint was moral, not physical, but was no less real on that account. The fact was that the American people simply would not permit such actions to be taken in their name.

At the other end of the conflict spectrum—low intensity conflict—idealism is also a major constraint. In the abstract a counterinsurgency war is easy to win. Massacre, murder and starve to death people by the millions and tens of millions as did Joseph Stalin, Mao Tse-tung and Pol Pot and the

⁴U.S. Congress. Senate. Joint Committee of Armed Services and Foreign Relations. *Military Situation in the Far East*. 82d Congress. 1st Session. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951) Part 5, page 3598.

⁵Arthur L. Kohloff. “The BUF’s Go Downtown,” *VIETNAM*, August 1990.

⁶Among other critics of Vietnam war strategy see Major Andrew F. Krepinevich, Jr., *The Army and Vietnam* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

⁷Author’s notes. From 1974 to 1975 the author was assigned to the U.S. Delegation, Four Party Joint Military Team (FPJMT), an organization set up by the Paris Peace Accords of 1973 to resolve the POW/MIA issue. In his capacity as chief of the negotiations division he travelled frequently between Saigon and Hanoi. For an account of this mission see Stuart A. Herrington’s *Peace With Honor?* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1983).

starch goes out of the revolution. Do what they did in Argentina and Uruguay and 'disappear' people by the thousands. Or do what the death squads of both the left and the right do in Central America. But such tactics are not options for U.S. military forces. They are not options because the American people will not stand still for them.

This is no post-Vietnam human rights phenomenon. Brigadier Jacob W. "Hell-Roaring Jake" Smith is a case in point. A veteran of the Civil War and the Indian campaigns, Smith was part of the American military force sent to crush the Philippine Insurrection at the turn of the century. After the massacre of an American rifle company on Samar in September 1901, Smith ordered a reprisal, telling the commander "I want no prisoners. I wish you to kill and burn. The more you kill and burn the better it will please me. I want all persons killed [later defined as those ten years of age and older] who are capable of bearing arms in actual hostilities against the United States ... [Samar] must be made a barren wilderness."

The American public was horrified by the slaughter. The Senate opened hearings on the matter. The press was full of atrocity stories. "Nothing can justify the use of torture or inhumane conduct" by U.S. troops, said President Theodore Roosevelt, and ordered Smith recalled to face trial by court martial. Found guilty, he was officially admonished and retired in disgrace.⁸

Idealism and Public Support

American idealism and America's sense of morality was deeply offended by General Smith's actions, so much so that public support for the war was severely undermined. The American Anti-Imperialist League used it as a club with which to beat the Roosevelt Administration, and Mark Twain recommended that the American flag be redesigned, with black stripes and the stars replaced by the skull and crossbones.

Public support is no small thing. As former Army Chief of Staff General Fred C. Weyand, America's last military commander in Vietnam, said so eloquently, "The American Army really is a people's Army in the sense that it belongs to the American people who take a jealous and proprietary interest in its involvement. When the Army is committed the American people are committed, when the American people lose their commitment it is futile to try to keep the Army committed. In the final analysis, the American Army is not so much an arm of the Executive Branch as it is an arm of the American people."⁹

Reaffirming that fact almost a decade later in a speech to the National Press Club on November 28, 1984, then Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger emphasized that "before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, there must be a reasonable assurance we will have the support

⁸The General "Hell-Roaring Jake" Smith incident is discussed in Stanley Karnow's *In our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York: Random House, 1989) pages 187-194.

⁹General Fred C. Weyand, "Vietnam Myths and American Realities," *CDRS CALL* (July-August 1976); also reprinted in *Armor* (September-October 1976).

of the American people and their elected representatives in the Congress.”¹⁰ To gain and maintain such support, the American people must be convinced of the morality of American objectives and the morality of American military actions. When this morality is called into question, when American idealism is violated, public support begins to erode.

The Chaplain as Moral Touchstone

Army combat commanders in the field have fire support coordinators attached to advise them on the best use of artillery fires to support their mission. They have forward air controllers to coordinate the best use of air power. They have an S1 to appraise them of personnel matters, an S2 to keep them up to speed on enemy intelligence, an S3 to plan and oversee operations, an S4 to ensure the flow of arms, ammunition, POL, food, water, and other essentials and perhaps even an S5 to help with civilian control. And they have, but all too seldom use, what may be their most important advisor of all—their chaplains.

Chaplains are uniquely suited to both serve as the commander’s moral advisor to ensure that military actions are in consonance with America’s sense of right and wrong, and to create a climate of morality to ensure against war degenerating into the Hobbesian world of brigandage and barbarism.

To those who think such counsel unnecessary, consider the August 1965 incident at Cam Ne filmed by Morley Safer of CBS News. As Vietnamese women with terrified children clutching at their skirts wailed in the foreground, U.S. Marines, Zippo lighters in hand, burned their homes to the ground.¹¹ Whatever miniscule tactical advantage was gained by that action was totally overshadowed by the enormous strategic damage it inflicted on American public support. Burning defenseless women and children out of house and home wasn’t something Americans should be doing. Those were the kinds of things the bad guys did.

Where was that unit’s chaplain while this was going on? Did he question the morality of the operation? And if he did, did the commander listen? These are the same questions that arise again almost three years later during the running amok of elements of the 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry at My Lai in March 1968.¹²

The worst atrocity in the entire history of the U.S. Army, its litany of rape, sodomy and cold-blooded murder was even worse than was portrayed in the press. Where were the battalion, brigade and Americal Division chaplains when the atrocities were taking place? Where were they during the next year while the atrocities were being covered up? What kind

¹⁰Caspar Weinberger, “The Uses of Military Power,” News Release Nr. 609–84, OASD (PA), November 28, 1984. Page 6.

¹¹See Morley Safer, *Flashbacks: On Returning to Vietnam* (New York: Random House, 1990) pages 84–93.

¹²See Colonel William Wilson (USA, Retired) “I had prayed to God that this thing was fiction . . .” *American Heritage* (February 1990) See also General W.R. Peers, *The My Lai Inquiry* (New York: Norton, 1979).

of moral climate had they crated, or failed to create, that would allow such a thing to happen? Those are hard questions, questions that have not gone away with the end of the Vietnam war.

Except for the short forays into Grenada and Panama, we have an Army with almost no combat experience. And we have those, such as retired Army Colonel David Hackworth, who are now preaching that in war morality is of little consequence, and on the battlefield “studs” and “warriors” make their own rules.¹³ This is a dangerous development. As Lieutenant General Richard G. Trefry, the former Inspector General of the Army, warned “the espousal of this Hackworth doctrine may manifest itself ultimately in shameful tragedies such as My Lai. . . . The base cruelty of war requires a code of civilized behavior . . . that is manifested in the professional ethics of the military. Without such standards, there is no basis for the existence of an Army in a civilized nation.”¹⁴

Those who founded this nation knew that. They knew that it was not possible to be good without God. That’s evidently why they founded the Chaplain’s Corps in 1775, even before they founded the Republic itself. In today’s peacetime Army, where the Rambos seek to set the moral climate, chaplains face a difficult task—to ensure that soldiers and their leaders understand that it is not “soft” to care about civilian suffering, it is not wimpish to minimize enemy casualties. Protecting people is what the American Army is all about.

As the late Air Force Major General Edward Lansdale, one of the CIA’s most hardboiled operatives, pointed out, “the most pragmatic course for Americans [is] to heed the idealism of our country’s political tenets and make them the basis for our acts . . . the ideal of having a government ‘of the people, by the people, for the people’ [is] the strongest defense any country could have.”¹⁵

It is precisely because their religious calling has sensitized the Chaplain’s Corps to the importance of people that it qualifies them to serve as the Army’s moral touchstone. But it will not be easy to be good. As Professor Tinder concludes, “Being good politically means not only valuing the things that are truly valuable, but also having the strength to defend those things when they are everywhere being attacked and abandoned.”

¹³See in particular David Hackworth’s *About Face: The Odyssey of an American Warrior* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989) and my review in the November 1989 *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, pages 124–125.

¹⁴Lieutenant General Richard G. Trefry (USA, Retired), “Letters to the Editor,” *Army*, December 1989, page 10.

¹⁵Major General Edward Geary Lansdale (USAF, Retired) *In the Midst of Wars* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pages 369, 373.

Sex In The Forbidden Zone

Peter Rutter

Twenty years ago I began my psychiatric practice with the unchallenged belief that having sex with my patients was completely out of the question. I assumed that everyone in my professional community also observed this prohibition.

It took me nearly a decade to stop believing in the myth of the beneficent doctor. I discovered instead that sexual exploitation by men of women under their care or tutelage is not unusual and in actuality is quite common. Furthermore, I found remarkably similar patterns of sexual contact not only by male doctors and therapists, but by male clergy, lawyers, teachers, and workplace mentors. These highly eroticized entanglements can occur behind closed doors, in any relationship in which a woman entrusts important aspects of her physical, spiritual, psychological, or material welfare to a man who has power over her.

Sex in the Forbidden Zone: What It Is

Sex in the forbidden zone then, is sexual behavior between a man and a woman who have a professional relationship based on trust, specifically when the man is the woman's doctor, psychotherapist, pastor, lawyer, teacher, or workplace mentor.

Sexual violation of trust is an epidemic, mainstream problem that reenacts in the professional relationship a wider cultural power-imbalance between men and women.

A radical shift in my outlook was shaped by a personal involvement in two highly charged, interrelated episodes. The first, a near-sexual encounter with a woman patient, forced me to acknowledge the side of myself that yearned for just such a forbidden episode.

Peter Rutter, M.D., is a psychiatrist in San Francisco, a faculty member of the C.C. Jung Institute, and an associate clinical professor, Department of Psychiatry, University of California Medical School. Copyright © 1989 by Dr. Peter Rutter, from the book, *Sex in the Forbidden Zone: When Men in Power—Therapists, Doctors, Clergy, Teachers and Others—Betray Women's Trust*. Reprinted through special arrangement with Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc., Los Angeles.

The second episode, the disclosure that a psychiatrist who had been my mentor and role model had for years engaged in sex with many of his women patients, shattered my naiveté so profoundly that I felt compelled to look as deeply as I could into this problem as a way of reshaping my sense of reality. Out of this investigation came answers about to be presented to the mystery of why so many men and women collude in sexually exploitative behavior, in and out of professional circumstances.

My Encounter with Mia

The experience came upon me suddenly, dangerously, in the closed chamber of my first psychiatric office, when I felt the psychological barriers protecting me from forbidden sexuality come tumbling down. It happened on a dark, rainy evening in early December when a patient I will call Mia came to her usual appointment with the unspoken, unplanned, but extremely compelling agenda to offer herself to me sexually.

Mia was a tall, dark-haired woman of twenty-five whose brightly colored clothes and quick pace masked her severe chronic depression. Her quest for happiness persisted despite the fact that life had dealt her almost nothing but deprivation and loss. Both of her parents had recently passed away after recurrent bouts with depression and alcoholism, and she had an older brother about whom she had hazy memories of possible sexual molestation. After drifting into street life and drug abuse in her late teens, Mia was trying to put her life together. She was off drugs, working as a receptionist for a plastic surgeon, and developing an interest in psychology.

During the five months she had been my patient, Mia and I had identified her pattern of becoming sexually intimate with men rather quickly because she felt she had no other way to keep them interested. Nevertheless, she had never been in the least bit seductive with me. But without warning, that night I felt her sexuality directed toward me from the moment she stepped into the room—with an intensity beyond anything I had yet experienced in the seven years I had been practicing psychiatry.

Mia made her way to the patient's chair, but she did not stay there. As she spoke, tearfully recounting a humiliating rejection she had suffered the day before with a man she had been dating, she gradually slid off the chair onto the floor and sat cross-legged in front of me. The sexual posturing in her behavior grew more intense as she pleadingly looked up at me, wondering through her tears whether men would always use her up and throw her away. In her desperate need for comfort, Mia began to edge her way toward me, brushing her breasts against my legs, beginning to bury her head in my lap. As she inexorably reenacted her familiar role as sexual victim, all she needed to complete it was my participation.

Nothing in my training had prepared me for this moment. As Mia moved closer to me, I sat frozen, neither encouraging nor stopping her. I was overcome by an intoxicating mixture of the timeless freedom, and the timeless danger, that men feel when a forbidden woman's sexuality becomes available to them. I felt all at once extremely powerful—and very, very vulnerable.

Another part of me, however, remained completely separate from this sexual intrigue, disbelieving that erotic contact between us could be imminent.

I knew that by doing nothing at all, I could simply allow Mia to touch me in what was certainly going to be a sexual way. I sensed that if I went ahead with this sexual encounter, I would be able to count on Mia to keep our illicit secret.

I made a choice in that moment, one that my more opportunistic side has at times regretted: I asked Mia to return to her chair. She did so without hesitation, as if a healthier part of her was poised for this precise request. In our respective seats, we were able to begin a therapeutic exploration of the way, in her blind search for a man's comforting warmth, she had repeatedly offered herself sexually to men. By my not complying with her seductive behavior, we were able to talk about it. After all, Mia had just done exactly what patients are supposed to do when they see their doctors: She was bringing me her illness, her self-destructive pattern, in the only way she knew how—by repeating it with me, right there in the room.

At this critical moment, the path taken depended not on her but entirely on me. In order to steer her toward the healthy side, I had to fight off some typically masculine components of my sexuality that were all too ready to accept Mia's self-destructive offering. I still shudder to think how close I came to harming the two of us.

I discovered at first hand just how passionate and dissolving the erotic atmosphere can become in relationships in which the man holds the power and the woman places trust and hope in him. It was suddenly clear to me that having sex with patients was not out of the question at all. In fact, it was both more readily possible and powerfully alluring than I had ever admitted to myself.

The allure of the forbidden is a central theme of male sexual psychology. It is present in the therapist's office and in any relationship of trust in which a man holds power over a woman's intimate aspirations.

Day after day, we men sit in inviolable privacy with women who trust, admire, and rely upon us. There is a constant pull toward greater intimacy. Therapists and clergy invite the women under their care to share secrets, sexual and otherwise, disclosed to no one else, without regard to social propriety or rationality.

These women make good on our invitations to intimacy, bringing us long-hidden feelings, dreams, and fantasies. These feelings, often laced with passions both luminous and dark, swirl about the room. In a mysterious way, almost like electromagnetic induction, we men cannot stop ourselves from beginning to experience, prompted by what women share with us, some of our own long-denied fear, injuries, hopes, and fantasies. Just as the woman in a relationship of trust may look to the man in power for an answer to what has been injured or unfulfilled in her, the man may begin to look to the woman as a source of healing for himself.

To me, and to all men in power, the woman can easily become a sympathetic, wounded, vulnerable presence who admires and needs us in an especially feminine way. If we have been working together for some time, a

familiarity and trust develops between us that starts to erode the boundaries of seemingly impersonal professional relationships. Whether they say so openly or not, these women often convey their feeling that we are treating them far better than they ever dreamed a man could. As a result, we may find ourselves experiencing a closeness, a comfort, a sense of *completeness* with these women that we have long sought but rarely found; many of them clearly begin to feel the same way about being with us.

Under these conditions, the rule forbidding sexual contact with these women can seem hazy and distant, it feels so easy, for us to cross the invisible boundary and merge with the woman in shared passion.

Yet every time I have found myself caught up in sexual fantasies about a patient, I have discovered, as I did that evening with Mia, that something holds me back—not just a rule against sexual contact, but a feeling that something of value, right there in the room, will be destroyed if that line is crossed.

The Forbidden Zone

I found a phrase—“sex in the forbidden zone”—to describe any sexual contact that occurred within professional relationships of trust.

The key elements in the way a man in power sexually exploited a woman's trust seemed to be virtually identical, whether the man was called a doctor, psychiatrist, psychologist, therapist, professor, mentor, priest, minister, rabbi, or guru. The difficulty a woman has in saying no to sexual contact was similar in all those relationships.

Although such relationships are meant to serve protective, nonsexual purposes, they often become intensely erotic, offering up intoxicating fantasies of sexual merger to the man in power, to the woman whose intimate trust he holds, or to them both. Despite the fact that men have moral, legal, and ethical responsibilities not to allow themselves to become sexually involved with their female patients, clients, parishioners, students, and protégées, there is a largely concealed epidemic, affecting over one million men and women, of exploitative sexual contact in violation of this forbidden boundary.

Although women are the obvious victims of forbidden-zone exploitation, men in power also victimize themselves through destructive expressions of sexuality, leaving untouched the wounds that lie hidden beneath their inappropriate sexual behavior. The damage caused by betrayal of intimate trust, in or out of the forbidden zone, is severe.

In some way, sex in the forbidden zone touches and wounds us all. Women are accustomed to being its victims, discovering again and again that few relationships with men can be considered safe from sexual demand. Even if sex never takes place, a woman must deal with a pressure that is expressed by a covert nuance of speech, a carelessness of man's touch, a subtle steering of a relationship in directions that serve the man's sexual aims.

If this man is important to her—as her mentor, her boss, her therapist, her pastor, even her friend or coworker—she may try to overlook

the sexual element or even begin to cater to it, for fear of losing a relationship of value. Yet I have found that when a woman makes *any* compromise with inappropriate sexual expression from a man, she yields control over her own intimate boundaries and begins a dangerous collaboration that can lead to her victimization.

My position is that *any sexual behavior by a man in power within what I define as the forbidden zone is inherently exploitative of a woman's trust*. Because he is the keeper of that trust, it is the man's responsibility, *no matter what the level of provocation or apparent consent by the woman*, to assure that sexual behavior does not take place.

On the other hand, when a man who has power over and intimate access to a woman maintains complete respect for her sexual boundaries, the healing promise of relationships of trust between men and women can be fulfilled.

The damage a man causes himself when he violates these boundaries is often elusive, because in the moment of forbidden sex he may be able to convince himself that he is satisfying a deeply felt need. Yet in the very act of exploiting the woman in order to feel more fully alive, he abandons the search for aliveness within himself. When a man's brief moment of forbidden sexual release is over, he is left with more emptiness than before. He is farther still from the access to resources within himself that his sexual fantasy represents, and he is in denial of his own psychological wounds.

One advantage of demarcating a sexual forbidden zone is that it allows us to identify relationships that have a potential for boundary violations *before* such violations occur. By recognizing in advance that certain configurations of relationship *invite* sexuality at the same time as they *forbid* its expression, we gain options that include prevention of damaging behavior. Given the way our culture encourages men to push against sexual boundaries, *any relationship whatsoever* of unequal power between a man and woman should be thought of as an arena for possible sexual-boundary violations. Intimate relationships of trust are especially vulnerable to boundary abuse because they invite both men and women to pour into them their strongest hopes, wishes, fantasies, and passions.

Let us look for a moment at the delicate balance between power and trust. Because of the power imbalance in our society, a man often has the key to a woman's career, health, and future. If there is any legitimacy to this power, it must be wielded in trust as part of an ancient moral bargain that endows men—fathers, teachers, physicians, religious, economic, and political leaders—with such authority. A man in a position of power over a woman holds a sacred trust to guard her welfare, guide her safely into life in the wider world, and eventually share the power with her so that she can, if she wishes, leave him and go her own way. When a woman is in the position of power, she, too, holds this responsibility. Today, however, the imbalance is all too frequently in the other direction.

There can be terrible, life-shattering consequences to a girl or woman when this trust is turned into a sexual opportunity by the man in authority. He binds her to him, and when he relinquishes her she is often too injured to find happiness in another relationship. She is likely to adapt to the victim

role, repeating it in other relationships, each time losing more of her self-respect and enthusiasm for life.

How a woman is treated in relationships of trust can make the difference between whether she experiences her femininity as a force to be valued and respected or as a commodity to be exploited. Sexual violation of the forbidden zone can kill off hope itself.

The Participants

Pastor-Congregant or Clergyman-Parishioner Relationships

I use "clergyman" and "pastor" generically for male religious leaders of any faith, even if that faith has leaders referred to by other names—minister, priest, rabbi, father, or patriarch. The most likely occurrence of the forbidden-zone relationship in a religious setting is in ongoing one-to-one meetings between a clergyman and a woman in his congregation, whether or not these meetings actually consist of pastoral counseling. Although religious and spiritual issues may provide the original motivation for these meetings, more intimate personal matters soon become involved.

The power of the pastor over the congregant is tremendously enhanced by his authority, if he wishes to exercise it, to describe to a woman her status with God. A sexually abusive clergyman can easily exploit this authority by telling a woman that her sexual involvement is part of a divinely ordained plan. Even sophisticated women can have difficulty resisting this argument if they are devoted to the religious vision that the clergyman represents.

Religious cults in which the guru or spiritual leader has sexual relationships with many of his female congregants are more blatant examples of this phenomenon. The leader exploits the trust and value of the spiritual relationship in the same way that therapists, lawyers, teachers, and mentors do in the privacy of their offices.

Mentor-Protégée Relationships

The term *protégée* means "one who is protected by someone older or more powerful." This states precisely the condition that creates the sexual forbidden zone. Because *protégée* is French for "a protected woman," it serves well as a generic term for the woman in all forbidden-zone relationships. We might let the meaning inherent in the word remind us that a man always has a duty to protect, not invade, his *protégée*.

In an educational setting, the mentor-protégée relationship can become a highly individualized outgrowth of the teacher-student bond. It carries with it the implication that the teacher has taken on a special responsibility for the student over time.

In the workplace, a woman may find herself developing an important one-to-one relationship with a man who is her supervisor or boss. The relationship takes on special meaning, often to the man in power as well as the woman. He is part teacher, part confessor, part guide. They may spend

many hours, even travel, together. Although the relationship has a nonsexual purpose, fantasies of sexual contact may develop in either mentor or protégée in the same way as they do in psychotherapeutic relationships.

The heightened intimacy and importance accorded to the mentoring relationship firmly establish the presence of a sexual forbidden zone. Although the stated ethics of the workplace rarely prohibit the development of sexual intimacy between mentor and protégée, any attempt to cross this line is likely to create the same kind of damage that occurs when a therapist and patient become sexually intimate.

If You're on the Edge: Stop and Get Help

When a man is on the edge of violating the forbidden boundary, he has a crucial, twofold task. His obligation does not end with the struggle, as difficult as it may be, to refrain from sexual enactment of his fantasies. He also must fight to maintain the original trust placed in him, to safeguard the elements of the woman's destiny that have been placed in his care.

In the long run, the injury of greatest consequence to a woman when a man crosses the forbidden boundary may not be from the sexual invasion itself but from her irretrievable loss of the purposes and meaning of their special relationship. The purpose may have been to foster her spiritual, professional, or intellectual development; it may have been to help her recover from injury, whether physical, emotional, or economic; it may have been a liberating rite of passage for her, which would have allowed her to pursue her career or find some measure of personal and social freedom. Whichever it might have been, the man on the edge still has a chance not only to spare a woman another destructive act of sexual invasion but also to strengthen the deeper purpose of the relationship.

This is the challenge to a man on the edge: First, he must refrain from any sexual action. Second, he must be sure that his sexual fantasies no longer skew his responses toward the woman. In short, he must give up all future hope of acting sexually with her. Third (and this can come only after the previous two requirements have been fulfilled), he must, when he is with her, set his sexual needs aside so that he can return to giving her the best that his professional role demands.

Finally, if he continues to be so overcome by his non-professional feelings toward her that he cannot maintain the highest standard of professional behavior, he must end their relationship with extreme care. In doing so he must clearly communicate to her that she is not to blame for this ending, that he is not angrily holding her responsible for the ending, that the ending comes out of respect for her rather than as another message that no powerful relationship with a man can exist without sexual exploitation.

In accomplishing all of this against his onrushing erotic fantasies, a man certainly needs help. His decision to look for help, and the quality of the help he gets, may have a pivotal effect on his life and future, as well as on the future of the woman whose trust he must uphold.

By help, I mean finding someone with whom to talk. It can be a man or woman; a professional, such as a pastor or therapist; a colleague, brother, friend, teacher, sister, mentor, even spouse. The social role does not matter; what does matter is the attitude of the helping person toward the man on the edge, and the sensitivities the conversations help engender in him.

It is a hopeful sign when men can ask for help. Besides making them less likely to damage women, they are expressing a nascent awareness that they, too, have been damaged by our culture's distorted views of the feminine. In addition, a forbidden-zone crisis presents a man with a special opportunity to heal the loss of intimacy from the father, if as a result he can develop a new therapeutic or mentoring relationship with a man who is willing to share his own struggles with forbidden sexuality.

No matter to whom he turns for help, a man on the edge must be respected for having chosen to deal with a problem of his erotic fantasy life. The last thing he needs is a reaction of judgment that will make him even more ashamed of his inner life than he already has been. The more his inner experience can be valued, the better he will be able to perform the vital task of separating inner experience from outer act.

Conversations with the helping person also must direct the man toward understanding the great potential damage to the woman. To the extent that his struggle to maintain the sexual boundary helps him feel compassion for the wounded feminine, a man will have returned from the edge with a lifesaving gift—not only for the woman whose trust he has preserved but for himself.

Moral Leadership And The Drug War

Richard C. Gardner, III

Roger C. Welsh

It's obvious the toll of illicit drugs on American society has reached a great magnitude and is so pervasive that it can no longer be characterized as merely one of those episodic societal "problems." The Department of Defense is rapidly becoming what Dick Cheney has called an "enthusiastic participant" in the drug control effort."¹

Until recently, most people in the United States associated national security with the "Cold War" and the Soviet Union. This "Cold War" struggle in most minds has been replaced by a "War on Drugs". The United States enemy in this war is both domestic and international, though to a large extent they are one in the same.

War on Drugs

The Secretary of Defense has said:

I believe that our military forces have the capability to make a substantial contribution in the area of successful drug interdiction, and I am asking them to make the necessary preparations to carry out that responsibility.²

When we use the term "war," we usually think of combat forces, either regular or irregular, engaged in a shooting competition directly related to the national security of one or more of the participants. The war on international drug trafficking is not a normal war but nonetheless threatens

¹*Defense* 89, (Washington, D.C.) Nov-Dec 1989, p. 2, col. 1.

²*Ibid.*, p. 4.

Captain Richard G. Gardner III is an Army Military Intelligence Officer Advanced Course Student at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. He holds a B.S. degree from Northeast Missouri State University, Kirksville, Missouri.

Chaplain (MAJ) Roger C. Welsh is a chaplain/leadership instructor to Officer Candidate and Infantry Officer Basic students at the United States Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia. He holds a Master of Divinity degree from Talbot Theological Seminary, LaMirada, California, and a Master of Theology degree from the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, Berkeley, California.

our national security. Nearly every week a different politician has called for the military to assume the lead role in this nation's "War on Drugs".

These demands have been met to a limited extent. The Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act assigned the Secretary of Defense the following responsibilities:

1. To serve as the single leading agency of federal government for detection and monitoring of aerial and maritime transit of illegal drugs into the United States.
2. To integrate U.S. command, control communications, and intelligence assets dedicated to drug interdiction into an effective network.
3. To approve and fund state governor's plans for expanded use of the National Guard in support of drug interdiction and enforcement while in state status.

With these authorizations, the military took on responsibilities that previously belonged to the CIA and the Treasury Department. The use of the National Guard to monitor state and federal borders with Mexico and the Army National Guard aircraft in the District of Columbia to provide surveillance is now commonly practiced in the drug enforcement effort.³

Some supporters believe in an even larger military role than the present one. Ultimately, that role may include:

1. U.S. Naval inspections of suspected drug carrying ships on the high seas.
2. U.S. Air Force AWACS monitoring of flights of all aircraft originating from south of the United States border.
3. U.S. Army control of the border between the United States and Mexico.

The United States military in the past has been very reluctant to assume a role in what it considers a law enforcement area.

Money is Power

Eliminating drug production and export is officially the highest diplomatic priority in Colombia and one of the top priorities in Bolivia and Peru. Although Latin America supplies marijuana, heroin, and cocaine to the United States, cocaine is the primary concern. Having forged extensive ties with the economic and political power structures of the Andean countries, the cocaine industry has developed into a formidable antagonist.⁴

The financial resources of both local drug dealers and foreign cartels such as the Medellin are so vast they are mind boggling.

For some in the United States, the drug trade has become an economic way of life. The money these traffickers make is unparalleled. Some of this money remains abroad, stashed in offshore tax havens such as Panama, while some is invested in United States real estate, securities, and business. For example, it's estimated Colombian drug traffickers held \$12

³New York Times, July 22, 1988, Part B, p. 8.

⁴Rod Brunk, "Illicit Drugs and National Security: The Threat and a Rational Response," (Briefing developed by Army-Air Force Center for Law Intensity Conflict, 30 July 1989).

billion worth of assets in the United States in 1983. Because it's an illegal, tax-free industry, drug traffickers spend an estimated 10–20 percent of their operating expenses to create a secure climate for business operations. This money goes for weapons, private security forces, information networks, bribes to law enforcement officers, and contributions to political campaigns.⁵

Estimates of the costs of illicit drug trafficking to the U.S. vary from 50–75 billion dollars by the Conference of Selected Law Enforcement and Intelligence Agencies, to 110–160 billion dollars by the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, *Annual Report, 1984*. The 110–160 billion dollar estimate is used most by people in the position to know the extent of the drug problem.

There are some estimates which suggest the world-wide flow of narcotics result in an annual industry of over 300 billion dollars. In an interim report to the President's Commission on Organized Crime, the illicit drug trade in the United States alone was estimated to create a money laundering industry of between 30 and 50 billion dollars annually. Looking at it from another aspect, the direct costs of illicit drugs are greater than the combined gross national products of Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia combined.⁶ And if we use wholesale prices or import value, illicit drugs are the United States' second largest import at 70 billion dollars.

Corruption

When an illegal business as large as the cocaine industry searches for protection, it spawns corruption on a massive scale. Traffickers can and do manipulate the key institutions of public life, including the political parties, the press, the police, the military, and the judiciary. Traffickers are known to exercise enormous influence in large cities such as Medellin and Cali, Colombia, and even dominate entire regions, like the Beni Region, Bolivia.

Traffickers undermine the judicial system in various ways. When caught in the net, they pay the police to release them. If they cannot escape the police, judges presiding over the cases are often offered the choice of "lead or silver" ... death if they convict, a bribe if they set aside the charges. In 1987, there were 16,200 homicides in Colombia, a 15% increase over 1986.⁷ In 1984, the head of the justice ministry was assassinated as a result of his efforts against the Colombian drug cartels. The same fate fell on the Colombian Attorney General, Carlos Hoyos, in January of 1988. If traffickers do end up in jail, they can usually bribe their way out.

Traffickers can also influence public opinion and the political process. Certain publications depict drug dealers as progressive and public-spirited citizens. Sponsoring public works and social services in communities which the government has ignored wins good will for the drug kings. This doesn't really cost the drug kings that much money, but the political impact is immeasurable. Traffickers can also become political

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁶*National Narcotics Intelligence Consumers Committee Report*, Apr 1989.

⁷Brunk, *op. cite.*, p. 23.

power brokers as drug money is an important underpinning for the entire democratic process. Traffickers contribute indiscriminately to campaigns, often through front organizations. Traffickers have also been known to prepare their own slate of candidates for local political office.

To gain popular support for their criminal activities, drug traffickers also donate money to social welfare programs; Pablo Escobar (a cocaine king in Colombia) built 450–500 2-bedroom cement-block houses in a Medellin slum, now renamed “Barrio Pablo Escobar.” He has built more public housing than the government, has financed sewage repair, educational facilities, clinics and sports plazas.⁸

Conspicuous consumption is another hallmark of the drug industry, giving rise to absurdly unbalanced development to remote areas where drugs are cultivated. An example is Tocache, Peru, in the upper Huallaga Valley: there are six banks, six telex machines, several stereo dealerships, a disco, and one of the largest Nissan dealerships in Peru. Tocache also has no paved streets, no drinking water and no sewage system. In Medellin, Colombia cocaine traffickers flaunt ostentatious lifestyles, buying apartment buildings, Mercedes-Benzs, BMWs, helicopters, airplanes and antiques.

1. National

When a nation's government loses its morale and ability to accomplish its duties it imperils that nation. Just such a future could face the United States. Limited corruption does not stay limited either in its size or scope. The corruption of a government, no matter what the level, invites subversion of that body.

The subversive activities of the drug traffickers are considerable. They have corrupted high level officials, undermined allied governments, and destabilized countries. They have bribed ministers, generals, judges, and police chiefs from Colombia, Haiti, The Bahamas, Panama, Honduras, Mexico, and other countries. Lower level authorities are also on the drug traffickers' payroll. Even worse, those who cannot be bribed are often murdered. The massive scale of drug trafficking would not be possible without the collaboration of high level authorities. It's only a matter of time, according to some sources, before drug traffickers will erode good government in the United States. For the drug trafficker, it's simple economics: they have discovered that it is cheaper to pay bribes than to pay taxes.⁹

2. Military

Whether through corruption, bribes, payoffs, percentages of the deal, or coercion, the threat or use of force against someone, the drug cartels have had an impact on the military forces of Latin America.

Each Latin American military force has approached the dilemma differently. The Colombian Army in the eye of the storm, recognizes the potential problem.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 10.

As with any large-scale narcotics law enforcement program there is ample opportunity for corruption and there is evidence of at least a small amount in each of the drug enforcement agencies. It is largely due to this consideration that the Colombian military has played a limited role in drug suppression and senior military leaders have expressed their strong preference for not assuming drug enforcement responsibilities.¹⁰ This decision undoubtedly enabled the Colombian military to achieve some of its success in 1989 when it was committed to its country's "drug war." The only problem that remains is whether the Colombian military can fully succeed before it is corrupted.

The Bolivian Army, on the other hand, has made itself an integral player in drug trafficking.

In the latter part of the 1970's and earlier 1980's, the Bolivian military establishment was notorious for its participation in the global illegal narcotic trafficking network. Although efforts have been made to remove the most infamous of the military traffickers, corruption persists. In a milieu such as Bolivia, with its well developed underground criminal network, it is perhaps natural that members of the Armed Services would remain or become active in all facets of the Bolivian narcotics business."¹¹

Low Intensity Conflict

Drug traffickers, combined with their ties to guerrilla and insurgent groups, to governments and economies, police and military, and the population as a whole, is a form of low intensity conflict. It is a struggle waged by the drug dealers against the established governments and society to achieve political, social, economic, and psychological objectives. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that there is a war going on and the traffickers have the upper hand.

Who funds this war? The U.S. government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars to fight against the traffickers and to help some 100 countries to counter the drug threat. Meanwhile, the American public spends more than 100 billion dollars annually to support the international drug network as 23 million American consumers smoke, snort, and shoot themselves into oblivion. Through inattention and self-delusion, we are surrendering domination of our cities, our criminal justice system, our health and well being, our children's future, and perhaps our national character, to criminals and international drug dealers. It is impossible to overstate the dangers drug use poses to our country and citizens.¹²

Ethical Problems

The United States military is being quickly drawn into the "War on Drugs." The participation of the military is not without ethical questions. Some of

¹⁰*Latin American Military Involvement in the Illicit Drug Trade*, October 1984, Defense Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., p. 14.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹²Brunk, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

the reasons for a lack of desire to fight the "Drug War" have been given by senior military leaders, such as:

1. Not the job of the military.
2. Not properly equipped for this type of mission.
3. Lack of law enforcement training.
4. Against the law, specifically the Posse Comitatus Act.
5. Distracts the military from its primary mission of national defense.

Corruption is probably the single greatest concern of senior military leaders regarding a growing military role in drug enforcement. To this point in American history the United States has been able to maintain a politically neutral and, for all practical purposes, corruption free military. Polls taken recently show that Americans trust, believe, and have confidence in their armed forces. The U.S. military has cultivated this image and is very reluctant to jeopardize it. Though members of the military services have participated in drug dealing and trafficking, the amount of this participation has been insignificant enough to draw any public scrutiny.

Many Latin American military forces have succumbed to the temptations presented in participating in drug enforcement. Whether voluntary or not, the results of a military involvement in drug enforcement invites corruption of its personnel, loss of national values, and, ultimately, loss of national control.

Moral Leadership

Military leaders realize the vulnerabilities posed by their personnel participating in drug enforcement. Whether through corruption or through coercion, the loyalty of this country's military forces could be sorely tested. Obviously, greed can be called the number one corruption tool. As shown in Latin America, military personnel near the bottom of the rank scale are easy targets for bribes and kickbacks. The low pay, long hours, and hazards of duty are seldom compensated for monetarily. To this point, U.S. military personnel, by their lack of drug enforcement involvement, have not become targets of the drug dealers or cartels. A large criminal industry, such as the drug trade, has the money and resources to corrupt this nation's forces.

Examples of future corruption could include the following:

1. An Air Force AWAC radar operator paid to have an equipment malfunction at a certain time.
2. A naval officer paid to have his ship patrol on a different course or to disclose patrol routes.
3. An army officer paid to change or disclose patrol routes along the U.S. and Mexican border.

Any number of hypothetical examples can be supposed. Unfortunately, the amounts of money involved can easily make these scenarios a reality. They have already become that for the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Border Patrol, and local police agencies.

The clear lesson as shown by the Bolivian example is that once the corruption of the drug trade is present in a military force, the ability to

counter it is extremely remote. The pervasive influence of narcotics corruption can reach through a country's military force from the lowest private to the highest general, as with Panama's Noriega.

If it can be assumed that the United States military role in drug enforcement will increase, then how well the military performs its mission, as in the past, will depend not as much on its technical strength but the ability of its personnel. It has already been shown what potential problems await the U.S. military. Like any military force who has participated in drug enforcement, the danger is present.

This ability to withstand the corruption of the drug cartels does not rest solely on the United States security measures, but rather on what has always been available to this nation's military, effective leadership. For purposes of this article, leadership responsibilities will be divided between executive level, in this case colonel and above; advanced level represented by majors, lieutenant colonels and sergeant majors; and junior level as captains and below. These responsibilities are not fixed and do cross between junior, advanced, and executive leaders.

1. Executive Leaders

The executive military leadership role in the "War on Drugs" is to set the tempo and the policy for the conduct of the "war."

The executive leader has many methods of ensuring that his personnel remain true to the mission and also remain free from corruption. The easiest methods involve personnel security measures such as background investigations and counter-intelligence programs. Though this "war" has a different name, the same leadership principles apply; they may need to be focused differently.

The U.S. Army's manual on leadership, Field Manual 22-100, lists the eighth principle of leadership as "alleviate causes of personal concerns of your soldiers so that soldiers can concentrate on their jobs."¹³ In the context of the drug war, this principle could mean to ensure that soldiers are adequately compensated financially to alleviate some of the temptations of drug cartels to purchase their loyalty. As was shown, one of the key reasons for Latin American military corruption was a low level of pay. Pay alone will not lead to a corruption-free military force, but it can surely serve as a deterrent. Executive military leaders will need to understand the dangers of a low paid military force engaged in drug enforcement. Budget deficits and a change in eastern Europe notwithstanding, a low paid serviceman will be susceptible.

2. Advanced Leaders

The advanced military leader should emphasize national and military values. This would take the form of individual service oriented training with emphasis on such things as the meaning of national service, the reason

¹³U.S. Army Field Manual 22-100, *Military Leadership*, October 1983, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., p. 232.

behind the military's role in the "War on Drugs", and the consequences of losing this war. Concentration of training on such things as the Ethical Reasoning Process and the forces that make up that process could produce an awareness in the military force as a whole above the implications of corrupt actions. A dedication to duty must be instilled to prepare members of the military for an unseen but present enemy.

3. Junior Leaders

The junior leaders' leadership role in the "War on Drugs" is just as critical as the executive and advanced levels, because of his ability to impact first hand on the individual members of the military.

A junior leader has to literally take the hands-on approach to maintain the integrity of his personnel. While he can often times do little to set their pay rate, he can have a significant impact on their psychological and emotional ability to withstand corruption. The junior leader has to be a team builder just as he has always been. Through instilling and maintaining a war fighting spirit, members can see that they are playing a key role in their country's battle against drugs. The understanding must be made that an individual who allows himself to be corrupted hurts his buddies just as much as a soldier who deserts from the battlefield.

The junior leader must understand human weaknesses and vulnerabilities. He has to be aware of the situations that can corrupt his personnel such as excessive debt or drug abuse. Early detection of problems and subsequent corrective action could preclude that service member from being turned by the enemy. The junior leader has to place himself in his subordinates' shoes so as to understand their susceptibility to corruption and then take action to prevent it.

Conclusion

The potential positive impact of the United States military against this country's drug problem is as great as its potential cost on the services as a whole. The nation itself is at stake whether through inaction on the part of the military to assume a leading role and thus allowing its country to sink in a morass of drug abuse, or to enter into the fight and risk integrity in the process. The United States military has never failed to answer the call of its country. Through solid preparation, as if for any war, the military can be victorious. If the understanding is made that its personnel are the key to this victory and that through good basic leadership its personnel will respond, the war can be waged successfully. The path to victory lies not on the technical road but rather on the personnel road and with the leaders who choose that road.

As a people, we survived the Civil War, the depression, and two world wars, none of which challenged this country like we are being challenged today. We have children who are born addicted, and other children who are recruited to crime before their teens by the drug dealers. They use these children to build a business surrounded by violence and

profit. We have drug dealers on street corners, in our law offices, on our high school and college campuses, and on our grade school playgrounds. We have a major obligation to create and maintain a drug-free society for the future health and well-being of the people of the United States. We can no longer deny the seriousness of the problem. As a chaplain corps we have the moral obligation to be sensitive to these issues by proclaiming the appropriate relevance to our commanders and constituents.

The factors that produced this problem lie within us as individuals and within our social fabric. The forces needed to rid this country of its drug problem also reside within us. Without a demand for illegal drugs, there would be no illegal drugs. If we are to succeed, we cannot wait, for we are in a fight for our national life, and we must commit ourselves to success. It cannot be a war of words or containment, but rather action and victory. The manner in which we deal with the threat of drugs today may well determine the success or failure of this country in the future.

Bibliography

- Abbott, Michael H., "U.S. Army Involvement in Counterdrug Operations—A Matter of Politics or National Security?" in *USAWC Military Studies Program Paper*, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 30 March 1988, pp. 1-25.
- Armed Forces Journal*, *Armed Forces Journal Int.*, September 1989.
- Bagley, Bruce M., "Colombia and The War on Drugs," in *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1988, pp. 70-92.
- Brunk, Rod, "Illicit Drugs and National Security: The Threat and a Rational Response," briefing developed by Army-Air Force Center for Low Intensity Conflict, 30 July 1989.
- Cheney, Dick, "DoD and Its Role in the War Against Drugs," in *Defense 89*, American Forces Information Service, Alexandria, VA, Nov-Dec 1989.
- Ehrenfeld, Rachel, "Narco-Terrorism and the Cuban Connection," in *Strategic Review*, Summer 1988, pp. 55-63.
- Latin American Military Involvement in the Illicit Drug Trade*, Defense Intelligence Agency, Washington, DC, October 1984.
- Lee, Rensselaer W., "Why the U.S. Cannot Stop South American Cocain," in *Orbis, A Journal of World Affairs*, Ed. Daniel Pipes, Fall 1988, pp. 499-519.
- New York Times*, New York, NY, July 22, 1988.
- Perl, Raphael F. and Roy Surrett, "Drug Control: International Policy and Options," in *Congressional Research Service Issue Brief*, Library of Congress, 31 August 1988, pp. 1-15.
- Perl, Raphael F., "Policy Alert International Narcotics Control: The President's March 1, 1988 Certification for Foreign Assistance Eligibility and Options for Congressional Action," in *Congressional Research Service Issue Brief*, Library of Congress, March 4, 1988, pp. 1-11.
- Shultz, George P., "Joint News Conference, Guatemala City, August 1, 1988," in *Secretary of State Bulletin*, October 1988, pp. 2-20.
- "The Supply of Illicit Drugs to the United States," in *National Narcotics Intelligence Consumers Committee (NNICC) Report*, 1987, April 1988, pp. 1-90.
- U.S. Army Field Manual 22-100*, Military Leadership, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, DC, October 1983.
- Washington Times*, February 11, 1988.
- Washington Post*, March 10, 1988.

Comradeship and Sex Discrimination

Kelly M. Fitzpatrick

These voices, these quiet words, these footsteps in the trench behind me recall me at a bound from the terrible loneliness and fear of death by which I had been almost destroyed. They are more than motherliness and more than fear; they are the strongest, most comforting thing there is anywhere, they are the voices of my comrades.

—Erich Maria Remarque

Military manuals acknowledge the indispensable role played by unit cohesion, “the bonding together of members of a unit or organization in such a way as to sustain their will and commitment to each other, their unit, and the mission” (Defense ix). Military literature not only confirms this, it also provides insight into the relationship which must first exist between soldiers for cohesion to occur, comradeship. All of what has been written about this subject, however, addresses comradeship between men; now that women are in the military there is some concern about whether women and men can be comrades. In his recently published book *Weak Link*, Brian Mitchell claims not only that women can’t form comradeships with men, but also that they even prevent men from forming this relationship with each other. My goal in this paper is to address this matter first by examining the nature of comradeship itself, as a relationship between soldiers; to show the necessity of the relationship; and ultimately I’ll discuss the possibility of such a relationship existing between male and female soldiers.

“Military cohesion” is that term used to describe the functioning of a group of soldiers as a group; that is, how well a given set of individuals works as a unified whole toward a common goal. It further indicates something about the nature of the relationship between the members of the group. Cohesive groups not only move as single organisms toward the successful accomplishment of a given task, but also do it in such a way as to distinguish their members as having subordinated self-interest to willingly conform to certain values and norms of the group (Malone, p. 83). The

Captain Fitzpatrick is an English instructor at the US Military Academy at West Point. She graduated from Boston University with a B.A. in English, and received a Master of Arts in Philosophy from Johns Hopkins University in 1986. She has served with Adjutant General units in Korea and commanded a company at Fort Hood, Texas.

more oneness the group exhibits, the more cohesive the group is. And the more cohesive the group, the greater the likelihood that the unit will win on the battlefield. Clearly then, cohesion is not only desirable but necessary, and so military leaders should pursue those things which promote cohesion.

Leadership manuals like FM 22-103, "Leadership and Command at Senior Levels", offer guidance on how to promote cohesion. Most of us who've spent time in the military are familiar with these concepts. First, the commander must formulate and clearly communicate her *command intent* to the unit. This element ties into yet another: a clear command intent provides common knowledge of what must be done so that everyone has a clear *focus on the future*. The commander must provide the kind of *command climate* which convinces soldiers that their leaders care about them personally and professionally. She must demand *disciplined proficiency*, excellence rather than mere competence at military skills; this creates confidence among soldiers. *Shared values and experiences*—meaningful common activities which involve working and playing together—bond unit members. Finally, *delegation* empowers subordinates, allowing them to shoulder their share of the responsibility for accomplishing the goal and to accept ownership (FM 22-103, p. 61).

Experience proves that these six elements promote unit cohesion. But what does cohesiveness have to do with comradeship? How are they related? Cohesion is a desired end and comradeship is the means of achieving it. By way of illustrating the relationship I'd like to claim exists between cohesion and comradeship I'll use an analogy of the construction of a house and the arrangement of its bricks. The house can't be called a house unless the bricks which went into its construction conform to a certain arrangement.¹ At the very least, they must have mortar between them and each brick must support the other bricks around it in such a way that the structure eventually does what a house should do. It's up to the bricklayer to arrange these bricks properly. In virtue of this relationship the materials are no longer merely mortar and individual bricks, nor are they just bricks held together by mortar. In this particular arrangement the fact that they are bricks becomes unimportant, though it is still true. If the bricklayer has done her job well, the materials will have become a house.

Likewise, a military unit can't be called cohesive unless its soldiers stand in a certain relationship to each other. It's not good enough for them just to work together. If the unit's leaders, like the good bricklayer, have done their job, then these soldiers will have the materials for building a relationship which involves a deep-seated commitment to other unit members and ultimately to the mission. So just as the building materials must be arranged in a certain way prior to our being able to call the house a house, so must the soldiers in a unit stand in a certain relationship to each other before they can be called "cohesive." This relationship—comradeship—is necessarily prior to cohesiveness.²

¹This is an Aristotelian notion, to be sure.

²These elements, while present to some very limited extent during training exercises, aren't experienced as acutely in peacetime as in war. War makes the need for establishing comradeships all the more obvious.

Before a unit can achieve the desired end of cohesiveness then, the unit commander should provide the proper materials and properly arrange them, eventually transforming a group of individuals into one whole. A significant disanalogy exists, however: military leaders don't have the same degree of control over their soldiers that a bricklayer has over her tools and building materials. Soldiers aren't inanimate bricks. Although a commander may be able to provide the ingredients for cohesion, that commander cannot herself make soldiers into comrades. Instead, it is up to the soldiers themselves to do much of the work. Building of relationship of comradeship involves a conscious choice on the part of individual soldiers, a decision to accept the other soldier as a soldier, and to become committed to him as a member of the whole. The commander can't force members to make these commitments to each other, but she must at least nurture the process so as to ensure that nothing prevents the relationship from being built.

There are other elements, elements which can't be provided by leaders, which can promote comradeship as well. Suffering and danger, as J. Glenn Gray states in *The Warriors*, also contribute to the construction of this relationship and have a powerful influence over soldiers (p. 89). Gray notes that comradeship—or what he calls the “confraternity of danger”—is “unequaled in forging links among people of unlike desire and temperament, links that are utilitarian and narrow . . .” (p. 27). These factors, then, force individuals to learn the importance of subordinating their personal desires and identity for the sake of the whole. In the process of doing this they also learn the *necessity* of overlooking personal differences, because focusing on them endangers not only accomplishment of the mission but the survival of the unit as well. It ultimately creates ties between strangers, significantly improving their chances of defeating the enemy and avoiding getting killed themselves.

But discussion of comradeship solely in terms of its usefulness would be misleading. For it is useful only incidentally. To complete the above quote from Gray, comradeship is “no less passionate because of [its] accidental and general character” (p. 27). Indeed, focusing on this incidental characteristic does rob it of its intimate, passionate nature. My intention in even indicating its usefulness is not to claim that men do form comradeships only because they recognize the usefulness in doing so, but to suggest that if one recognizes the incidental advantage to be gained, then someone who is otherwise reluctant may be convinced to abandon such resistance for this reason if for no other.

Despite the cynicism with which Gray views comradeship between soldiers³, he does capture many of the features of this relationship which serve as evidence of its “passionate” nature. This passion is communal, for

³Gray's claim is that the common experience of the dangers of war has only a temporary effect on men, and that once they are no longer “under the influence”, the comradeship eventually disappears. Occasionally they can regain these feelings, but only by putting themselves under the influence of something else—alcohol. This portrayal certainly doesn't do justice to the strength of this relationship, which many veterans (my own male relatives included) will attest is just as strong between them and their comrades today as it was in wartime.

comrades often love each other like brothers. They also have grown to respect and trust each other as a result of having helped each other overcome hardship. Loyalties are fierce, and weld the group together. This loyalty sustains them through dangerous times as they pursue their common goal. Most noteworthy, though, is a soldier's willingness to die for his comrades, giving no thought to what this means to the self (p. 91).

Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* also does a superb job of portraying this passionate relationship, especially as it exists between the novel's main character, Paul, and his comrade Kat:

We have more complete communion with one another than even lovers have. We are two men . . . in our hearts we are close to one another . . . What does he know of me or I of him? Formerly we should not have had a single thought in common—now we sit with a goose between us and feel in unison, are so intimate that we do not even speak . . . I love him. (pp. 85–86).

This “communion” is compelling in both its simplicity and its depth. These two men, destined to be strangers but for the war which brought them together, seem to have become even more intimate with each other in this nonsexual relationship than either would have been within the context of a sexual relationship with a woman. And this despite the fact that they had so little in common before sharing the experience of battle. Differences in personal background become unimportant in this particular environment:

The things that existed before are no longer valid . . . Distinctions, breeding, education are changed, are almost blotted out and hardly recognizable any longer . . . It is as though formerly we were coins of different provinces; and now we are melted down, and all bear the same stamp . . . First we are soldiers and afterwards, in a strange and shamefaced fashion, individual men as well (p. 229).

They put aside differences based on their lives as “individual men”; all that is essential is that they are soldiers, struggling against a common enemy—death:

Every expression of life must serve only the preservation of existence . . . All else is banished because it would consume energies unnecessarily. [Death] has awakened in us the sense of comradeship, so that we escape the abyss of solitude (p. 230).

Let me return for a moment to Paul's observation, “First we are soldiers and afterwards, . . . individual men as well.” This seems to capture a critical feature of comradeship: *first* we are soldiers. To prevent someone from becoming part of the whole for reasons grounded solely in his life as an individual man seems dangerously juvenile, because these reasons have become so clearly irrelevant to the matter at hand, winning and surviving. What would it be like to exclude someone in this way? “He can't enter into this relationship with us because he comes from a wealthy family” or “He can't enter into this relationship because he's not a Christian”—what does this have to do with soldiering?

So the basis of this commitment must be in the soldier rather than in the person. But merely donning a uniform and claiming to be a soldier doesn't automatically grant one acceptance as a comrade. Acceptance is conditional. What becomes important at this point is for the soldier to *demonstrate* that he is a soldier. By doing this he at once establishes to

others his identity and thereby earns membership into the unit. Because of the possible consequences of the soldiers' activity, each must prove his worth as a soldier in order to give other soldiers a reason for trusting him. This is all part of developing the mutual trust so important in comradeship.⁴

So far I've made a conscious effort to discuss comradeship as a relationship between soldiers as soldiers, not as one between soldiers as men. Or to describe it in a different way, as Paul's observation above indicates, it occurs between soldiers-who-happen-to-be-men, not between men-who-happen-to-be-soldiers.

I think it's worth elaborating on this sort of dichotomy, for it exists in other relationships as well. Within the constructed relationship of "family" we could take as an example a father and son. Each shares the characteristic of manhood, yet they relate to each other first as father and son, and only secondarily as man and man.⁵ The dichotomy becomes clearer still if we look at a relationship which involves a woman and man. Such a relationship might take one of several "traditional" forms: sister-brother; daughter-father; mother-son; wife-husband, and so on. While each of these relationships may have one characteristic in common—for our purposes, simply that it exists between a man and woman—the activities these individuals may engage in are rather narrowly prescribed. Some activities which are accepted in the context of one relationship, between a husband and wife for instance, are proscribed when the relationship is that of brother-sister. Once again, to describe any of these relationships solely in terms of the fact that it exists between a woman and man is to focus on an aspect that fails to enlighten the outsider as to the nature of the relationship.

Nowadays some soldiers are men and some soldiers are women. If comradeship is built not by regarding a soldier as a man but as a soldier first, that is, in terms of what he does as a soldier, then this rule also ought to apply in the same way to soldiers-who-happen-to-be-women. They should be accepted into or excluded from this relationship not for gender-based reasons, but for reasons strictly related to their identity as soldiers.

There are some who argue that this isn't possible, however. Brian Mitchell, in his recent book, *Weak Link*, claims that male soldiers are incapable of relating to female soldiers as soldiers. Moreover, the mere presence of women in the military has a detrimental impact on the behavior of men (p. 189) to the extent that it "inhibits male bonding, corrupts allegiance to the hierarchy, and diminishes the desire of men to compete for anything but the attentions of women" (p. 190). The latter consequence he

⁴Malone states that, "When a new soldier joins the team, he won't be accepted automatically. He'll have to *earn* membership in the team. The team will check him out, mostly on military skill. When the team sees he's *trying and learning*, they'll accept him as a 'pro'" (p. 118).

⁵The best illustration I can offer for this is the way we tend to use the language: when introducing his father to a friend Hoss Cartwright says, "*This is my father, Ben.*" The father-son relationship takes precedence over the man-man relationship. And what the latter might entail, I'm not sure. Without some context as a frame of reference, I don't know how they would relate to each other. Wouldn't they have to search for some common ground even as a minimal foundation for their interactions?

claims is "because men like women," they have "difficulty treating women as they treat other men. They cannot be indifferent to sex" (p. 191). As support for this Mitchell quotes "one old soldier" who calculatingly sends his "pleasant and attractive" female NCO to brief senior officers: "'Anyone who doesn't think he's a man first and a soldier second just isn't paying attention'" (p. 191).

The shift in priorities indicated by comments such as this one are curious for a couple of reasons. First, it is diametrically opposed to the way male soldiers depict how they view themselves in their interactions with other male soldiers (as soldiers-who-happen-to-be-men). Second, this reversal occurs not because of anything the female soldier (seen, by the way, simply as a woman, not even as a woman-who-happens-to-be-a-soldier) does; her mere presence turns the world upside-down. According to this portrayal then, we are all victims of our biology, for our hormones alone determine how we relate to each other. When the two people involved are a man and woman, their biological structure permits them to interact in no other way than in sexual terms.

There are a few problems with an argument like Mitchell's. It implies that in the absence of female soldiers male soldiers simply would become comrades; it changes the nature of comradeship from something that is earned in virtue of one's exhibiting soldierly proficiency to something that depends on hormones alone. If this were true, then there would be no need for the types of manuals the military develops in order to help leaders build cohesive units. Biological necessity would ensure men bonded together. Instead, units must rely on training to instill the required discipline into men. This idea is related to a second deficiency in Mitchell's argument: it denies the effects of training. If training can effect comradeship among men, surely it has an impact on units consisting of both male and female soldiers as well. If nothing else, realistic training allows all soldiers to recognize that they are dependent on each other for survival. Realizing this in turn helps them to understand the need for relating to one another as soldiers first.

After all, free will plays a role in every human activity. We can and do make choices about how and with whom we interact. Although it would be futile for me to argue that biology plays no role in interactions between the sexes, biology is only one factor involved in those interactions. It can be mitigated by other factors, such as training, or in more extreme circumstances, the suffering and danger of war.

The fact is that comradeship does exist between some male and female soldiers. Judging from my own experience, what seems to be the real stumbling block on the path to comradeship isn't an inability to relate as soldiers, but more a fear of what might develop if a male soldier were to become as intimate with a female soldier as he is with his male counterparts. The passionate caring and concern shared by male comrades, they fear, would seem to lead inevitably to sexual intimacy. I think this fear indicates a search for a model to follow in establishing the "right sort of intimacy". In this case I'd like to point out that the familial intimacy which characterizes comradeship between male soldiers also characterizes the comradeships I've experienced and witnessed between male and female soldiers. That is, men

often describe comradeship in terms of brotherhood: "I felt closer to everybody in that unit at the time than I do my own blood brothers and sisters. Because it was us . . . It was THE family" (Malone p. 11).

The characteristics of comradeship described by both Gray and Remarque fit such a familial model for this relationship. Gray even refers to it as the "confraternity of danger" (p. 27). There do seem to be strong similarities between comradeship and brotherhood. Brothers are born into a family; they don't have the opportunity to leisurely discover and choose each other. There is a sort of recognizable necessity which binds them together—the preservation of the family. Brothers frequently are intimate in the way Remarque's character Paul describes his intimacy with Kat: they share secrets, they work and play together, they challenge each other. But perhaps most important of all is the mutual trust close brothers have in each other, which, like comradeship, in the face of adversity often inspires a willingness not only to fight for the other's sake but also, if necessary, to die for the other's sake. These characteristics of brotherhood are also characteristic of comradeship.

The comradeship I've had the good fortune to experience strongly resembles this familial relationship; I thought of (and still do think) of these men as more than fellow officers; we were like brother and sister. My thinking of them in this way did not diminish my professional opinion of them, nor did it diminish their professional opinion of me, for this relationship had come about as a result of the professional respect we had for each other. This indicated the extent to which we were willing to go to ensure the other's personal and professional safety and well-being. We were committed to each other and to the unit; this commitment was in addition to—not instead of—other personal relationships each of us had.

In closing, comradeship can and does exist between the sexes, and when it exists, this is the way it works: male and female soldiers accept each other as soldiers, have respect for and trust in each other's skills, and become committed to each other as "family members." Just as comradeship between men resembles brotherhood, comradeship between men and women resembles a brother-sister relationship. Soldiers-who-happen-to-be-men and soldiers-who-happen-to-be-women sometimes are physically attracted to each other. This is not a "natural outcome" of seeking comradeship; sexual intimacy is altogether different. When this happens, they are not seeing each other as soldiers first. Whether soldiers pursue sexual intimacy or familial intimacy depends on conscious choices they make. For we are not victims of biological necessity, as Brian Mitchell and others would have us believe. Instead, we do have the ability to form commitments to each other in a meaningful, passionate way, a way that we can model after yet another "traditional" relationship, that of the family. Furthermore, we *must* work to form these commitments to each other in order to ensure the success of the unit and, ultimately, the survival of every soldier in that unit.

Bibliography

- Defense Management Study Group on Military Cohesion. *Cohesion in the US Military*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1984.
- Gray, J. Glenn. *The Warriors*. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Malone, Dandridge M. *Small Unit Leadership*. California: Presidio Press, 1983.
- Mitchell, Brian. *Weak Link*. Washington, DC: Regnery Press, 1989.
- Remarque, Erich Maria. *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Trans. A.W. Wheen. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1929.

Modern Warfare and the Christian Conscience

Donald L. Davidson

Editor's note: The following is a prayer breakfast message given at SHAPE Headquarters, Mons, Belgium, on 25 January 1989.

No one can serve two masters. Either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to one and despise the other. You cannot serve both God and money.

Jesus

I know this is a strange text for you who serve at SHAPE under fifteen national flags and the common flag of SHAPE. We all serve under many masters: family and community, as well as nation, alliance and universal humanity. And each of these masters makes legitimate claims on our allegiance. Yet, as Christians, there is only one *Supreme Master* who claims ultimate allegiance in our lives.

Because all these masters are important values to us, we try to serve them all and to avoid conflicting demands between these masters.

In the final analysis, however, when conflict does exist, there is only one Supreme Master and that is God! All others are "lesser gods". Christian conscience sensitive to God's will is our principal guide in deciding between conflicts of duty to our many masters. The primary function of Christian Ethics is to help us avoid these conflicts and, when unavoidable, to decide between our duties as citizens, soldiers, family members and Christians.

This is an exciting but turbulent time for considering ethical uses of military force. How should we respond to the tactics of terrorism? Are revolutionary movements popular struggles for liberation and self determination, or Communist expansionism—or both?

Should we negotiate force reductions with Gorbachev, while he continues to build new tanks and missiles daily? Are modern weapons (nuclear, chemical and biological) too destructive and indiscriminate to be used?

Chaplain (Colonel) Donald L. Davidson is Post Chaplain at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. He holds a Th.M. from Harvard, and a M.Div. and Ph.D. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. He is the author of *Nuclear Weapons and the American Churches*, published in 1983 and was an ethics instructor at the US Army War College and the US Army Chaplains' School.

What will come of calls for restructuring and reductions in NATO by Europeans, the U.S. Congress and retired U.S. generals? If war should come, are our soldiers trained to fight ethically?

I will not discuss each of these issues, but they are the questions that give great urgency to our subject of "Modern Warfare and the Christian Conscience". Primarily, this morning, I will share with you some general principles from Christian tradition and the contemporary church, and my approach to troublesome questions we as soldiers' face, as we seek to plan and fight within the limits of the Christian Conscience.

1. Can a Christian "Bless" War

Can a Christian, in good conscience, fight for peace (be a "peace maker") while preparing (or fighting) for war? Can a Christian serve in the military and still be faithful to the teaching of Christ? While serving in Greece in the late 1970s, I took a group of American soldiers to the beautiful and peaceful monastic peninsula called Mt. Athos (the "Holy Mountain" to the Orthodox). Accompanying us on this pilgrimage was a minister whose congregation was composed primarily of personnel from the American Embassy in Athens. One day as we rested in the shadows of a Russian Orthodox monastery, he asked my chaplain's assistant a simple question: "How can a Christian, in good conscience serve in the military?"

This minister questioned the compatibility between the responsibilities of an individual follower of the Prince of Peace and the military duties of a soldier.

The church is also concerned about war. In 1929, in the uneasy period between the World Wars, the Presbyterian Church in the United States expressed the following conviction: "The church should never again bless a war, or be used as an instrument in the promotion of war".

In 1982, a good friend of mine from the Christian Church (Disciples), Dr. Robert Steffer, similarly concluded: "The Church can no longer voice its approval of warfare and military force as a means of conflict resolution among nations. The Church should stand for peace, not war"!

Although these statements sound inimical to soldierly duties and the military profession, I believe they are generally correct. The Church should not "bless" war and violence. The Church should stand for peace, not war!

The world today is experiencing an epidemic of violence, which Christians and the Church must stand against—not for! The daily headlines of *Stars and Stripes* illustrate this epidemic:

- 1 Jan 89 "Washington averaged murder a day" (367 homicides in 1988, 60% drug related; the highest percentage in the nation: 60 murders per 100,000 people. LA averaged more than 2 murders a day: 734 in '88, 23 per 100,000 people).

- "El Salvador Mired in Death" (7,000 Marxist Guerrillas vs 56,000 government soldiers; 70% rise in summary executions: 90 by Army, 46 by "death squads", 33 by rebels; 169 total reported by Catholic Church).

- "Bomb downs Pan AM Flight 103, killing 270" (occurred 21 Dec 88)

● 5 Jan 89 “2 hostages, gunman killed during shoot-out with police”

● “Teen critical after eating cyanide-tainted yogurt”

As these headlines indicate, violence is rampant—among the youth, on the streets, between gangs, between societies. We have become a society that is enthralled with “Rambo.”

Even more disturbing than these “peacetime” reports is the dramatic growth in wartime casualties in the last century. In the American Civil War, *half a million* died, and 90% of these were soldiers. In WWI this number reached *10 million*; during WWII, approximately *fifty million* died, two-thirds of which were civilians.

It is estimated that in a nuclear war, casualties could well exceed *400 million*, the vast majority of which would be civilians.

The effect on those who fight wars and live is also often disastrous. In the Middle Ages, knights went from the battlefield to confession to be cleansed from the sin of war. Today, soldiers go to counselors to be treated for “delayed stress syndrome” (Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome). It has been said that there are “no atheists in foxholes”.

But for many soldiers, this is not the case. A soldier told me recently that he had not been to church since seeing his buddies blown up at a base camp in Vietnam. It was certainly not the experience of a desperate German soldier whose army was surrounded in 1943 at Stalingrad. On the last plane out, he sent a letter home which read in part:

“In Stalingrad to put the question of God’s existence means to deny it. I must tell you this, father, and I feel doubly sorry for it. You have raised me, because I had no mother, and always kept God before my eyes and soul”.

“And I regret my words doubly, because they will be my last. . . . You are a pastor, father, and in one’s last letter one says only what is true or what one believes might be true. I have searched for God in ever crater, in every destroyed house, on every corner, in every friend, in my fox hole, and in the sky. God did not show Himself, even though my heart cried for Him. . . . God was not there . . . and if there should be a God, He is only with you in the hymnals and the prayers, in the pious sayings of the priests and pastors, in the ringing of the bells and the fragrance of incense, but not in Stalingrad”.

(Kermit Johnson, *Realism and Hope*, John Knox Press, 1988, p. 101).

Surely, the church can not “bless” the devastation of violence and war in our world.

General Sherman was right: “War Is Hell! Kermit Johnson, retired U.S. Army Chief of Chaplains, recently declared: We, [Christians] must challenge war “as an activity worthy of human sacrifice and awe. War must be revealed, instead, as Archbishop Runcie [Church of England, following the Falklands war] termed it, “a sign of human failure”, belonging not to the sacred order of life, but to the demonic order of death” (Johnson, p. 65).

Whatever else we may say, war is never “good”. War is evil and we should never welcome the prospects of such destruction. The Church, nor we, should ever “bless” war. It is wrong!

The great Saint Augustine cautioned that war should always be approached with a "mournful" spirit!

2. War is Wrong, but, is it ever the "Right" Thing for a Christian to do?

Is it ever right to do wrong, so that good may come of it? We must be very careful in answering this question. Evil, including terrorism and war crimes, have come from saying "yes"! But are we not sometimes faced with the choice of "lesser evils"? How should we respond when confronted with conditions like those described by Queen Beatrice of the Netherlands in the Spring of 1940:

"Fellow Hollanders. The lights have gone out over free Holland. Where only two weeks ago there was a free nation of men and women brought up in the cherished tradition of Christian civilization, there is now the stillness of death! Oppressed, threatened, watched on every side by a power that will tear out all hope from the soul of man. The unhappy people of Holland can only pray in silence for those who have lost their voice, but not their hope of their vision, in the struggle against the onslaught of barbarism. Long live the Netherlands". (In Corrie Ten Boom, *The Hiding Place*)

When a neighbor or a nation has been knocked flat by a brutal oppressor, is it not right to help the neighbor stand again, by resisting the aggressor? When his own homeland in North Africa was invaded, Augustine affirmed: "no Christian ought to fail to resist evil by effective means which the state alone makes available to him".

Paul Ramsey was echoing Augustine when he declared: "It is the work of love and mercy to deliver as many as possible of God's children from tyranny, and to protect them from oppression". Ramsey concluded: Jesus taught his disciples to turn their own cheek, but he did not instruct them to lift up the face of another oppressed brother to be struck on both cheeks.

When is it right to resort to the evil of war? When it is necessary to stop an even more evil aggression! In his seminal work entitled *Just and Unjust Wars*, Michael Walzer explains:

"Aggression is the name we give to the crime of war. We know the crime because of our knowledge of the peace it interrupts—not the mere absence of fighting, but the peace-with-rights, a condition of liberty and security that can exist only in the absence of aggression itself. The wrong the aggressor commits is to force men and women to risk their lives for the sake of their rights. It is to confront them with the choice: your rights or (some of) your lives! Groups of citizens respond in different ways to that choice. . . . But they are always justified in fighting; and in most cases, given that harsh choice, fighting is the morally preferred response. . . .

"Aggression is a . . . crime because . . . it challenges rights that are worth dying for".

When confronted by aggression, Walzer continues:

"Resistance is important so that rights can be maintained and future aggressors deterred. The theory of aggression restates the old doctrine of the *just war*: it explains when fighting is a crime and when it is permissible, perhaps even morally desirable. The victim of aggression fights in self-defense, but he isn't only defending himself, for aggression is a crime against

society as a whole". (Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1977, p. 51, 53).

When is it right to go to war? According to the *Just War Tradition*, mentioned by Walzer, it is right when the *cause* is defense and the *goal* is restoring a just peace; when war is conducted as a *last resort* and led by authorities who represent the victimized people; and when the war will not destroy more values than it preserves (proportion).

All of this may sound rather convoluted, so let me abbreviate: War is terrible destruction and an evil we should avoid, except when it is absolutely necessary to protect the lives and rights of peoples for whom we are responsible.

3. If War is Sometimes, Regretfully, Justified, Can it—Should it—Also be Limited?

(1) Limiting the Causes of War: Defense

"War is always judged twice," according to Michael Walzer, "first with reference to the reasons states have for fighting, secondly with reference to the means they adopt". (Walzer, p. 21) The first judgment, whether to go to war or not, is more often made by politicians than soldiers. But, as we learned in Vietnam, sooner or later citizens and soldiers also make judgments on the rightness or wrongness of war. And the *fact* that some wars *are* morally justified and others *are not* means that "Selective Conscientious Objection" is the fundamentally correct *ethical* position for a Christian to take. The Christian world praised the German pastor/theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer for resisting the Nazi war machine during WWII, and condemned at Nuremberg those who cooperated.

The implication of these judgments is that each of us retains the ethical responsibility to judge the causes of war, and to object to those who are wrong. However, soldiers in the first echelon most often do not have enough information to judge whether or not a war is justified. And, until we do, we should trust the judgment of our leaders.

What kind of wars, then, are morally justified? Those that are for the purpose of "protecting life and rights," that is, defensive wars! Nations have the right to protect their sovereignty against aggression, or to assist in the defense of allies. It is also legitimate, for nations to intervene on behalf of a people oppressed by a tyrannical-genocidal government (e.g. Duvalier in Haiti; Khmer Rouge in Cambodia). Not morally or legally justified are wars of conquest or wars primarily over differences of ideology or religion. The church long ago rejected the Crusades and the wars of religion following the Reformation, and the Thirty Years War, 1618–1648, in which possibly 50 percent of the male German population died.

(2) Limiting the Means of War:

The second judgment about war has to do with the means used in the conduct of battle; that is, policies, tactics, weapons, target selection and so forth.

This is the most contested arena in ethical discussions of war. There are some who consider any attempt to employ limiting rules on war a hopeless endeavor, much like those who scoff at recent German "Polite Driving Rules" designed to reduce aggression and death on the autobahns.

I, for one, hope the new German traffic laws are successful. And, with fifty thousand nuclear warheads in the world, attempts to limit the scope of battle *must* be successful. If we go to war and do not succeed in restricting the means of battle below levels presently available, there will be few values left to defend, and still fewer soldiers left to defend them! At a time when nuclear weapons were counted in the hundreds, Reinhold Niebuhr (in *Love & Justice: Selections from the shorter writings of Reinhold Niebuhr*, ed. D.B. Robertson, Peter Smith, 1976) accurately described the moral dilemma of the nuclear age:

"Thus we have come into the tragic position of developing a form of destruction which, if used by our enemies against us, would mean our physical annihilation; and if used by us against our enemies, would mean our moral annihilation".

How much more true is this statement now, when we count warheads by tens of thousands. This realization led American Catholic bishops in 1983 to express "extreme skepticism" about any use of nuclear weapons.

In 1986 Methodist bishops in the U.S. further concluded, that nuclear war, and even nuclear deterrence, "must no longer receive the churches' blessing". (*In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, Washington, D.C.; May 1986, pp. 34-35).

The bishops reject nuclear weapons as an immoral *means* in war, based on the ethical principles of *discrimination* and *proportionality*. In time of war, military forces are called forth to protect their peoples against enemy leaders, war makers and forces. Attacks directed against the general public, our own or the enemy's, are "indiscriminate", because they fail to distinguish between the "guilty" and the "innocent". Even in war, some people are legitimate targets and others are not. The laws of war make this same distinction. Walzer observes:

"The war convention rests first on a certain view of combatants, which stipulates their battle field equality. But it rests more deeply on a certain view of noncombatants, which holds that they are men and women with rights and they cannot be used for some military purpose, even if it is a legitimate purpose."

The principle of *discrimination* distinguishes between "killing" and "murder" on the battlefield. The latter we call atrocities and war crimes.

The principle of *proportionality* seeks to determine when the price is too high, when achieving the goal is too costly. Simply stated, a war, or a battle, that destroys more values than it preserves is "disproportionate". If we continually attack tactical military objectives that result in disproportionate losses, eventually we lose the war by attrition. Similarly, at the strategic level, more harm results than good if in the process, even in victory, we destroy our nation.

The bishops and other "helpful" critics reject nuclear war because the large scale use of these weapons would result in massive, indiscriminate

death to noncombatants and disproportionate destruction of targeted countries, and perhaps our world (“nuclear winter”). These prospects led President Reagan to say that “nuclear war can never be won and should never be fought”.

In 1986, while NATO was reducing the U.S. stockpile of tactical nuclear warheads, and while arguing before the U.S. Senate for an improved balance of conventional forces, General Bernard Rogers reflected: “The thought has to cross your mind,” [in Europe] “where are you going to use those weapons even if authority were given?” (Johnson, p. 19).

The same ethical principles that confront nuclear war, discrimination and proportionality, also reject *terrorism*. Terrorism is not just the tactic of outnumbered and poorly equipped warriors. It is a crime against society, and, as we see in Lebanon, a crime that can degenerate into moral chaos. Terrorism is a crime because it intentionally attacks innocent civilians, with disproportionate levels of horror, to gain notoriety for its cause, and to gain sympathy by prompting an overreaction from the targeted society or group.

Terrorism is wrong whether it is practiced by soldiers against noncombatants on the battlefield, or by terrorists against civilians in the world’s airports.

Summary:

If war is sometimes regrettably necessary; and if we wish to avoid an incompatibility between the duties of soldier and the dictates of the Christian conscience, then the *causes* for which we fight must be just and *means* with which we fight must be limited.

“As soon as men decide that all means are permitted to fight an evil, then their good becomes indistinguishable from the evil they set out to destroy”. (Johnson, p. 17; from Christopher Dawson, *The Judgment of Nations*).

4. What Would Jesus Say?:

Most of what I have shared with you this morning is a theological construct based on Judeo-Christian principles. But I believe these principles are consistent with the life and teaching of our Lord. Throughout his ministry, Jesus devoted his greatest time and attention to the poor and the oppressed. In his inaugural address at Nazareth he proclaimed:

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners, and recovery of sight for the blind; to release the oppressed, and proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor”. (*Luke 4:18–19*)

In his powerful parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus teaches us to be good neighbors to those who are victims of aggression. No doubt, had the Samaritan arrived on the scene during the attack, Jesus would have told how he “resisted” the violent robbers. (*Luke 10:25–37*)

By his own examples, Jesus demonstrated that he was not a pacifist, at least in the contemporary definition of that term:

- *John 2:13–17* records how he used force (whip) to drive the “sellers of grace” from the temple area.

● *Matthew 8:5-13* tells of a Roman Commander (Centurian) in Capernaum who asked Jesus to heal his servant. Jesus did not tell him to resign from the Army; He did not say to him, as he did to the prostitute caught in adultery, "go and sin no more". (*John 8:1-11*) Rather, Jesus praised his great faith! And he healed the Centurian's servant.

Have you ever wondered why, if Jesus were a pacifist, the temple guard came to Gethsemane to arrest Jesus armed with swords and clubs? Or, why, at the time of his arrest, Jesus' disciples were carrying their own swords? (These facts are recorded in all four Gospels. According to *Luke 22:49*, when the disciples "saw what was going to happen, they said, 'Lord, should we strike with our swords?'" *John 18:10* identifies Peter as the one who cut off the High Priest's servant's ear with a sword during the arrest).

No, I do not believe that Jesus was a pacifist. And I believe he *does* want us to defend against attack, as we have agreed to do in the NATO alliance.

But Jesus also had a decided preference for nonviolence. At the time of his arrest, Jesus did say "put away your swords". . . . "I am not leading a rebellion" (*Mark 14:48, Luke 22:51-53*). And he said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." (*John 15:13*) He also said: "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you." (*Matthew 5:44*) And more: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God". (*Matthew 5:9*) "Do not resist an evil person. If someone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also". (*Matthew 5:39*); this passage indicates Jesus' intent, but I do not take it any more literally than I do another verse in this passage, *Matthew 5:29*: "If your right eye causes you to sin, gouge it out and throw it away."

Summary

Jesus did not speak directly to the question of Christians serving in the military or fighting in war. But these verses point out the direction of his thought, which can be summarized as follows:

- All human life is sacred to God, and each person possesses the dignity and worth that comes with being created in the "image of God."

- We are all governed by the "Good Samaritan Law" of love and, therefore, should assist our neighbor in need, materially, emotionally, spiritually and in matters of security.

- In conflict between neighbors, nonviolent means of resolution are preferable, but violent means are permissible to save life.

- As "Peacemakers" (*Matthew 5:9*), we are "ministers of reconciliation" between neighbors and with God.

Pastoral Stops

Thomas R. Decker

The chaplain had not meant to make a pastoral visit in the motor pool. He had only wanted to check the post requirements for getting a driver's license for one of his assistants. As he was coming out of the motor pool supervisor's office, he met Staff Sergeant Wilkins, whom he did not recognize immediately because he was dressed in his camouflage battle dress uniform. The chaplain usually saw him on Sunday morning in "civvies."

The sergeant had a look on his face that asked the question: I wonder if he's going to speak to me.

If the truth were known, the chaplain would have liked to have gone right back to his office. He had, he told himself, "work to do." But here was the sergeant, the one who had the wife who looked as though there were something wrong with her, and he was lounging up against the motor pool garage entrance; he was smoking a cigarette and looking right at the chaplain.

There's no avoiding this, the chaplain thought. Duty calls. Better go ahead and make the best of it.

"Oh, hello there. Staff Sergeant Wilkins," the chaplain said, reading his uniform's name tag. "Your first name is, ah. . ."

"Wendell, sir. Dell for short," the sergeant answered.

Standing close to him the chaplain noticed that Staff Sergeant Wilkins' eyes were a remarkable clear blue. He didn't look at the chaplain the way most enlisted soldiers looked at officers. Staff Sergeant Wilkins did not avoid the chaplain's gaze. He looked right at him. For most soldiers, avoiding the eyes or manipulating a salute was a way of exerting some precious little autonomy when they realized that there was none to be had. But for Staff Sergeant Wilkins it was not a question of authority or power. The chaplain had the distinct impression that the sergeant felt himself to be an equal in spite of their differing ages and rank.

Chaplain (LTC) Tom Decker recently returned from seven years in Germany where he served in Mainz and Wiesbaden Military Communities. He is currently assigned to Fort Riley, Kansas and serves there as the Resource Manager for the Post Chaplain. Chaplain Decker is a clergyman of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

“Well, there, Dell,” the chaplain continued. “How’s it going? I know you were back in the states for a while, but you’re back now.”

The chaplain thought to himself that these were the warmups, the preliminaries. The main event was yet to come.

The chaplain’s insides were tightening up. His impulse was to cut it short, walk to the car, and get back to his office. God knew he had things to do, things that would certainly justify his not being here talking to the sergeant.

Staff Sergeant Wilkins put out his cigarette on the parking lot asphalt, whether it was out of respect for being in the presence of an officer or simply because there was a “No Smoking” rule in the motor pool, the chaplain couldn’t tell.

“Yeah, we’ve been back now about four weeks. But we haven’t been able to get to the chapel yet.” The staff sergeant smiled, boyishly, almost apologetically to the chaplain.

When Staff Sergeant Wilkins smiled, he revealed a gap where an incisor had recently been, on the upper right side of his otherwise perfect teeth. Aside from that cavity in his mouth, Wilkins was remarkably well groomed; he was blond and had a healthy tan. The chaplain thought that the gap in his teeth gave Wilkins a tawdry and low-life appearance. He couldn’t reconcile the missing tooth and Wilkins’ persistent appearance at chapel services. The chaplain had marked Wilkins’ slight drawl as being from Oklahoma or possibly Missouri, someplace deep in the Bible belt. Right now Staff Sergeant Wilkins was smiling with the full smile minus one tooth, and it was the smile that wore on the chaplain.

He knew that the sergeant had thrown him a line, and was ready to set the hook and reel him in. Wilkins was fishing.

“Your wife,” the chaplain volunteered, “Terri, isn’t it?”

Here it was. the chaplain was going into deep water, and he knew it. He was now guaranteed at least another twenty minutes in the motor pool, and who knew after that. But this was what he, the chaplain, was in the Army to do: to be with soldiers. But today he didn’t want to be there. What this guy wanted was probably more than he was able to deliver, at least today.

“Yeah, it’s Terri. Oh, she’s all right,” Sergeant Wilkins said, bobbing his head a bit.

There was a real pause, the first one since the two had encountered each other in the motor pool. The chaplain girded himself for what was to come next.

“She hasn’t been too well lately, has she?” the chaplain queried.

Dell Wilkins didn’t say anything except to shake his head, and for the first time since they spoke, he looked away, to the right, out into the motor pool. His foot grated the extinguished cigarette butt.

“What’s her trouble?” the chaplain asked. “I know she’s been sick, but with what I don’t know.” He surprised himself at how gentle this probe had been.

The chaplain thought to himself that she really was ill. It was true that he didn’t know what the problem was. He’d only seen her after chapel

services when they stayed for coffee, and the Wilkins were like stationary fixtures in the fellowship room. They just found a spot, usually near the door, stood there, and waited for somebody to talk to them. They didn't talk to each other; they just stood there waiting for somebody else to make the first move.

She looks different, the chaplain had noted to himself. Kind of pale and frail. Very frail. He was aware, but he had never really thought about it until he and Sergeant Wilkins were up close here in the motor pool, that Terri Wilkins' skin had the appearance of parchment, old, tight, and transparent. Her cheeks were beginning to sink in, and she looked far older than her 32-35 year old husband. She had thin, spindly arms, and her stomach protruded in such a way that the chaplain once thought she was pregnant, but somebody had told him, "No, that's just the way she is." He remembered that she always wore pant suits with what resembled maternity tops.

What the chaplain noticed about Terri Wilkins though was her head. Her skin had pulled so tightly around her eyes and the corners of her mouth that her facial features had taken on the strong resemblance of a skull.

Looking at her was like looking at a skull, albeit one that talked and laughed and did all the things that a normal, living person is supposed to do.

It occurred to the chaplain that this encounter was what the Staff Sergeant was waiting for. And wanting. Someone to ask about his wife. People must have noticed that she was different, but nobody knew, to the chaplain's knowledge, what was wrong with her. And to the Wilkins' disappointment, nobody asked.

But now the chaplain had asked. And the sergeant was free to share the secret of what it was like to live with a woman whose face was like a skull and whose skin was like parchment.

If the sergeant could tell anybody, he could tell this man of God. He really believed that. This was the *Chaplain*. He spoke the Word of God to him, to his now-shrinking wife, and to his two comprehending children. He spoke the Word from the pulpit; he prayed from the altar; he broke bread and distributed Communion Sunday by Sunday. And here they were, by an act of God, face to face in the motor pool. There was no congregation here. Only Dell and the chaplain, one on one. Somehow it was appropriate that the chaplain ask about Dell's wife. Somebody had to ask sooner or later, and Dell was glad that it was the chaplain, *his* chaplain.

"She's got sclerodermapolymyositis," he said. The word came right out, smoothly, no stumbling or stuttering. All the medical text book syllables were there. The accents, primary and secondary, were all correct. This was the nomenclature of the rare condition that spelled out why his wife's skin looked like parchment and was beginning to prematurely harden.

"Medical terms," the chaplain thought to himself as he searched the cool blue eyes to see if there was any pause any hesitation, any sign of regret or remorse.

The chaplain liked to congratulate himself that he could sense trouble in his parishioners. There was much that a person couldn't see in their lives, in their inner thoughts and soul. People were good at keeping secrets, but

the chaplain too was good at seeing past facades and false fronts. He was not often surprised by what he heard people say to him in counseling, in the strictest confidence. "I've never told this to anyone else before, but" Nothing surprised him.

This soldier said the name of the illness, sclerodermapolymyositis, like he'd had lots of practice saying it. He'd heard it from doctors, looked it up in the hospitals' medical libraries, and he'd read all the disease society's pamphlets which pinpointed the probable diagnosis, describing the symptomatology, and pronounced a solemn prognosis on how patients "could live a well-adjusted, fulfilling life by learning to cope with the obvious limitations." Sergeant Wilkins liked the word, "cope." Actually he thought it amusing in a pitiful sort of way. He was accustomed to fixing things: vehicles, training devices, military equipment of all kinds. You name it, and he could fix it. If you needed a new part, you just got it and put it on. Coping, however, was something you did when you couldn't do anything else. And Sergeant Wilkins, in the two times that he'd read the disease society's pamphlets, noted that there wasn't much hope for patients who had this disease. No new parts. Only coping. He thought that the disease society was good at passing out information for tract racks in doctor's offices, but they were not very good at giving people hope. He was convinced, all things considered, that there wasn't much to go on.

So Staff Sergeant Wilkins had learned to say the name of the disease perfectly: Scler-o-derm-a-pol-y-my-os-it-is. He knew that he'd have to explain it to his wife's parents, away from *her* ears, so they could understand and shake their heads in disbelief. He'd have to explain it now to his kids as best he could, and then again when they got older wondering whether they too would develop the same illness that their mother had. He knew it was necessary for the family's sake that he know the name of the disease well.

He'd explained his wife's condition to all his supervisors at his last duty station, and again when he got to Germany. Always they were sympathetic, and asked again what it was that she had, and always he patiently repeated the word over to them, letter by letter, perfectly pronouncing every Latin syllable, and they'd always shake their heads, asking if there wasn't anything that could be done for it, thankful somehow that it was *his* wife that had the disease and not theirs. Their concern, as sincere as it may have been, always translated into relief that this was one thing that they didn't have to deal with at home.

Dell was very good at responding to the queries of his supervisors and peers. He would explain that there wasn't much of anything that they, or anybody else, could do except to see to it that she got good medical care. "Thank God," he would say, "It isn't AIDS! But she is susceptible to almost any little illness that comes along." He went on to explain that in most people, in the progressive stages of the illness, the tissue on the organs would also start to harden, and this ultimately would lead to death.

Supervisors invariably didn't know what to say. Finally they would respond with the only way that systems people know how to respond to

human crisis: "We'll get you a DA Form 4187 to fill out so you can get transferred to where your wife can get good treatment."

The word, on the DA Form 4187, the Army's Request for Personnel Actions, had made the difference the first time when Wilkins' were in Germany and just started to live with the illness, and then back to the states, and now again on their return trip to Germany. At every assignment there were good doctors and excellent medical care. There was always a flurry of medical school interest among the younger doctors when they realized that *this* was a text book case.

The word was what did it. And Staff Sergeant Wilkins knew how to write it, how to spell it, and how to pronounce it.

But most of all he said it to himself, purposefully, quietly, intently, that if he, they, could put a name on it, the doctors would be able to put it into some culture dish, put it under a microscope, isolate a virus or a bacteria, make a vaccine or some high-powered pill, and kill it. Kill it, before it killed his wife.

And so he said it very precisely, very carefully. There was no room for error. This was the killer living in his own house, in his own wife, and the killer had a name. If you could name it, maybe, just maybe, you could track it and blow it away.

When Staff Sergeant Wilkins prayed, and he *did* pray for he was a religious man, he did *not* say the enemy's name. It was more important, he thought, to say the name of Jesus and the name of his wife. His prayer, in fact, consisted of just that: the name of Jesus and the name of his wife, Theresa. He used her given name, Theresa, in his prayers because that was her given name, the name he first knew her by, but now, of course, everybody called her Terri for short. She was to him, though, Theresa. The enemy with the long name, the enemy that coursed through his wife's veins, did not change Dell Wilkins' love for his wife, and he did not believe that it even changed Theresa before God himself.

Of course, the staff sergeant did not tell the chaplain that he prayed for his wife. He figured that the chaplain, man of God that he was, would take prayer for granted. It only seemed natural that a man would perform this elementary act of faith for the life of his wife. He did not have to explain that to the chaplain.

Staff Sergeant Dell Wilkins really believed that the Lord would somehow override the terrible swath that this enemy was cutting through his life and the lives of his children. He didn't like the idea of pitting medical science against the power of his God. He preferred to think that if the Lord could prophesy through Ezekiel and put skin on dry bones to raise up an army for Israel out of skeletons scattered across the floor of the valley of Jezreel, he could do the same for his wife. How, he didn't know, but the Word of the Lord made more sense to him than the disease society's pamphlet spouting wisdom about "coping with obvious limitations."

"She has a hard time sometimes, Chaplain." Wilkins offered. "Her doctor has had five other patients with this condition." Here Wilkins paused and then resumed his recount of the prognosis/diagnosis for the chaplain.

"They all died." He concluded. "It makes it hard for her. A lot of times she doesn't feel like doing much of anything."

The chaplain nodded slightly. He was following what the staff sergeant was saying, and right now he was impressed with Wilkins' perceptiveness.

"I tell her," he continued, "that she ought to get out more, go to chapel, get out of the house, but she really can't walk much further than from here to that barracks and she's out of breath. Any little exertion, and she's so tired that she's got to lay down and take a rest. I'm working on getting a car for her right now so she can get around. I figure that'd do her good. I've got one all picked out. A Ford. But I think it needs a water pump."

The chaplain told Staff Sergeant Wilkins that he agreed. She probably did need to get out more often. He thought to himself that the sergeant probably needed some words of encouragement even more than his wife. "God only knows," he told himself, "that if I were in his boots, I'd need more than words of encouragement."

He was tempted to offer to the sergeant the possibility of Mrs. Wilkins' leading a Bible study class on a weekday morning, "to get her out of the house." Then he thought better of it, because he wondered if people would relate to her, if they would understand, if they would be able to bear her burden which seemed so overpowering compared to any load that anybody else shouldered, but then he offered anyway.

"That's real nice of you to ask, Chaplain," Staff Sergeant Wilkins responded. He smiled broadly at the chaplain, and the chaplain refrained from wincing at the dark hole where the tooth had been.

"Well, Sir, I've got to go in here and see if they've got my van license yet. I know you've got places to go too. But I'm really glad that I ran into you."

"I am too," the chaplain said. He added, "I really just came in here to check on getting a driver's license for my assistant. You know how that goes."

"I sure do, Sir. Nice talking to you." said Wilkins.

He paused and then added, "I don't think we just ran into each other."

"You don't?" asked the chaplain.

"No, Sir. I think the Lord brought us here. I really needed to talk to you. It was the Lord's doin'. That's what it was."

"Well, Dell, you tell Terri that I'll say a prayer for her," offered the chaplain.

"I'll do that, Sir. Thanks a lot! It'll mean a lot to her, if you know what I mean."

The two parted company. The staff sergeant went into the motor pool's administrative area; the chaplain got into his car and drove to his office at the chapel.

The chaplain knew exactly what he'd tell his assistant about getting her driver's license. She'd known about it for two months; she'd put off testing for it—probably because she was afraid to take the test—but that was

no excuse, and the chaplain now wasn't going to take any more static from her. He knew what the process was; *she* knew what the process was! If she'd have done what she was supposed to do, this driver's licensing episode would be long over.

When he got to the chapel, he cursed softly to himself when he saw that somebody else had taken his parking place. He told himself that he would have been here sooner. He was only vaguely aware that his lateness was on account of having run into Staff Sergeant Wilkins with the sick wife, Theresa, and that night when the chaplain was undressing for bed, he couldn't—for the life of him—remember the last half of the word which rolled so easily from the sergeant's lips.

Sclerodermapolymyositis.

Dell Wilkins knew who the enemy was; it was probably that the chaplain did not.

Questions for Discussion

1. Who or what was the "enemy" in the story?
2. What is the pastoral ethic illustrated in the story?
How well is it exemplified?
3. What interpretation would you give to the title?

A Soldier's Love

Herman Keizer, Jr.

King David of Israel was a mighty warrior. His life is a primer for those who would lead armies. His last words stand like an autobiographical epitaph which give testimony that his house is right with God. "When one rules over men in righteousness, when he rules in the fear of God, he is like the light of morning at sunrise on a cloudless morning, like the brightness of rain that brings the grass from the earth" (2 Samuel 23:3-4).

David cannot be put into a neat stereotype of a warrior king. He defies classification. He is a man of valor, a man of war, skilled in tactics and strategy who demands respect and gets it from mighty men and ordinary citizens. He is prudent in speech and a man of good presence. He is a skillful player of the harp, a composer, a lyricist and a poet, a man of strength and tenderness. He is saint and sinner. David was a legend in his time. They sang folk songs about his legendary acts: "Saul has slain his thousands, David his ten thousands." God said of David, "Here is a man after my own heart." (Acts 13:22)

David knew the power of leadership in military organizations was made visible in an obedience born out of mutual love. He was not always mindful of that power, but he was experienced enough to hold that special love in reverence and awe.

In 2 Samuel 23 the narrator tells the story which illustrates that reverence. David is an old man again doing battle with an old enemy, the Philistines. David was camped in a stronghold at the cave of Adullam, while the Philistines were in the valley of Rephaim, garrisoned in David's home town of Bethlehem. The old king was tired of drinking the flat water of storage bags and had a thirst for water with some life in it. He remembered the taste of the water from the well at Bethlehem. He gives voice to his longing, "Oh, that someone would get me a drink of water from the well near the gate of Bethlehem."

Chaplain (Colonel) Herman Keizer, Jr., is Deputy Director of the US Army Chaplaincy Services Support Agency, Washington DC. He has served soldiers in Vietnam, Hawaii, Germany and the United States. He holds degrees from Calvin Theological Seminary, New York Theological Seminary and a M.A. from Columbia University, New York. He is a minister of the Christian Reformed Church of North America.

His idle words became a force that stirs three of his mighty men into action. At risk of their lives, these mighty warriors break through the lines of the Philistines, draw water from the well at Bethlehem's gate and bring the water back to David.

David refused to drink it, instead, he poured it out as an offering before the Lord "Far be it from me, O Lord, to do this!" he said. "Is it not the blood of men who went at the risk of their lives?" So David would not drink it.

What made these mighty men do such a foolish things? Their action had no strategic or tactical rationale. They could not justify their actions from any manual of war. They could stretch the point some and make the King's idle wish an order that needed to be obeyed, but that excuse doesn't stand very firmly. They did it because they had the deepest affection for this man who led their Army. They loved this General-King.

David's measure of greatness was to understand that they did it out of love. He had a deep appreciation that they acted a great risk to themselves. He valued the mercies they brought him. There was more in that cup than water. He experienced religious awe at the love they showed and he offered that love to God by pouring the water out onto the ground as a sacrifice.

Another story in David's life showing how soldiers love each other is the story of Uriah, the Hittite. Uriah was no ordinary foot soldier. He was a mighty warrior, listed last on an honored position in Hebrew lists, the roll of honor, as one who served in David's command. David tried to cover up his affair with Bathsheba by bringing Uriah back from the field of battle. David hoped that Uriah would sleep with his wife and thus conceal her pregnancy. But Uriah was too much a soldier.

David looks out over the castle wall and sees Uriah sitting by the campfire, not home with his wife. Much to David's displeasure Uriah refuses to go home and states as his reason the fact that his fellow soldiers were on the field of battle and in tents, therefore, it would be wrong for him to go sleep at home with his wife. David tries even harder to break that bond Uriah had with his fellow soldiers. The second night he gets Uriah drunk but this failed to move Uriah. So David plots with his field commander Joab to put this mighty warrior in the thick of the fight and ensure that he perish in battle. To David's shame he forgot that a soldier's love for his fellow soldiers is stronger than a soldier's love for his wife.

David knew better because David learned a soldier's love from his mentor and Prince, Jonathan.

The story of David and Jonathan is magnificent. The Prince was a mighty warrior himself. As prince he was his father's confidant and the heir to the throne. His acts on the battlefield were heroic. At Geba and Micmash he showed the charisma of leadership which turned the tide of battle from stalemate to victory.

Into his life comes this red-headed, young shepherd boy. David was a musician at Saul's palace for a short time. His music quieted the evil spirit in the king. David was sent home when Saul and Jonathan led the Army of Israel against the Philistines. David then shows up on the battlefield with

provisions for his brothers. The shepherd boy is now God's anointed one, God's chosen heir to the throne of Saul. With the confidence of Spirit of the Lord which accompanied that anointing, David defeats the giant Goliath.

Saul makes this young musician a leader in his Army and gives him his daughter as a wife. David and Jonathan are leaders together in the king's army and brothers-in-law. But they are more. They seal a covenant together. The prince, in gratitude for David's courage, strips himself of his robe, his armor, his sword, his bow and his girdle and gives them to David. These were precious gifts; there were few swords in Israel because the Philistines had a monopoly on the iron manufacturing. Jonathan, the scripture tells us, loved David more than he loved himself.

Jonathan maintains that love for David through the most difficult of times. When Saul's anger at David is so hot that David has to flee, Jonathan is still the friend of David. Slowly Jonathan becomes aware that he will not sit on his father's throne. He will not be king. God has chosen this shepherd boy whom he is mentoring in the art of war, to be the new king. Jonathan is not envious. His love does not turn to hate. In David's darkest hour in the wilderness of Zeph, Jonathan goes to David and strengthens his hand in the Lord. In that dark hour, Jonathan acknowledges that David will be king over Israel. The love of Prince to soldier remains. The covenant holds firm. What a wonderful love Jonathan had for David.

When Jonathan is killed, David sings a beautiful lament.

"How the mighty have fallen in battle!
Jonathan lies slain on your heights.
I grieve for you, Jonathan my brother;
You were very dear to me.
Your love for me was wonderful,
More wonderful than that of a woman."
(2 Samuel 1:25-26)

A soldier's love bound Jonathan and David together. David's lament is echoed in the heart of all soldiers who stand near their slain comrades. Soldiers love fellow soldiers. Soldiers love their leaders. That is why soldiers are willing to do battle and make ultimate sacrifices and why they use the language of family to explain what they are for each other. The love soldiers have for each other is the basis for ethics in this profession of arms. If we lose sight of soldier love, we will damage our ability to influence and lead soldiers.

Soldier love places all other loves at risk. David experienced this first hand during Absalom's Rebellion. His son, Absalom was determined to take over the throne of Israel from his father. He was nearly successful, having gathered an Army and run the King out of Jerusalem to the Judean desert where David re-grouped his army and counterattacked. In the ensuing battle, against David's wishes, his son was killed. Though his forces were victorious, David went into mourning in his camp. This so disturbed his troops that General Joab came to David and said, "Today you have humiliated all your men who have just saved your life and the lives of your sons and daughters and your wives. You have made it clear today that the commanders and their men mean nothing to you. I see that you would be pleased if Absalom were alive today, and all of us were dead. Now go out

and encourage your men. I swear by the Lord that if you don't go out, not a man will be left with you by nightfall." (2 Samuel 19:1-7) David has to end his mourning for his son and show his love for his troops who had risked their lives for him. Such is the love of soldiers, that it takes precedence over family.

The unlimited liability contract we all have with the Army, places our family love at risk. Soldiers are willing to lay down their lives for their friends. There is no greater love.

Soldier love demands that leaders honor that love and the loyalty that flows from it. Justice demands careful stewardship of that love. Leaders do not speak of idle tasks or personal whims because they know soldiers have a deep sense of obligation that can change idle wishes into orders. Leaders always need to understand the deep sense of the love soldiers have for them.

Leaders don't always want to look that love in the eye because the awareness of that love will touch all our decisions. Soldier love places all other loves at risk. How can the leader waste soldier's time when they are there because of love? How can leaders neglect a soldier's family when that family love is in jeopardy to soldier love? How can career concerns transcend the obligation to soldiers? Soldier love is purchased at the high cost of all the soldier's other loves. One watchword that needs to be on all our lips is "Look how they love each other." If we keep soldier love in front of us we will work harder to act rightly and justly toward soldiers.

Then perhaps might be said of us: "... he is like the light of morning at sunrise on a cloudless morning, like the brightness of rain that brings the grass from the earth."

Remarks To The National Prayer Breakfast, 1990

James A. Baker, III

Editor's Note: The following is a transcript of Secretary Baker's message to the National Prayer Breakfast on 1 February 1990, at the Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC.

This is a unique morning. Today, heads of state from three continents and citizens from approximately 150 nations of the world are meeting here in the spirit of Jesus Christ to pray together, to talk together and to seek to know each other better. I know we all hope that by meeting in this way we can help foster increasing bonds of friendship throughout the world.

Frankly, when I was asked if I'd be willing to speak with you today, I was hesitant. That hesitation came from the fact that after nine years here in Washington, in three different public service jobs, I am far more comfortable talking about the policy process, the political process, or any number of other topics. For me to discuss a personal journey of faith is a new experience.

But here I am and I want to talk with you "briefly" about faith, about friendship and about our collective spiritual responsibilities as leaders.

I am up here this morning because I believe that those of us who are put in positions of public trust should not be hesitant to speak about spiritual values. In fact, I believe spiritual values are important in the pursuit of world peace.

Pope Paul VI said at the United Nations: "The problems of the world are so great that perhaps the leaders of the world will have to learn to pray together."

It was in this very spirit that President Eisenhower, 38 years ago, began with a few members of the Senate and the House of Representatives to see if it was possible to pray together both privately and in this kind of assembly. President Eisenhower had a strong conviction that we need to build deeper and longer lasting relationships on a basis other than just economic or political. I think he would be excited to see the reality that his vision has become, if he could see us here this morning.

I spoke a moment ago about a personal journey of faith. Those of you who know me best certainly know that I do not feel like an expert on

The Honorable James A. Baker, III served in the Reagan Administration as Secretary of the Treasury and Chief of Staff. President Bush appointed him Secretary of State in 1989.

this subject. Like many of you, I am just one person genuinely struggling to put faith into practice in my life. But over these last nine years in Washington, I have gained some valuable insight into that process.

There are many who believe that living in this city makes developing one's personal faith more difficult. But for me, living in his centrifuge of power and politics has encouraged (and even demanded) spiritual growth. Power, of course can be intoxicating and addictive, and few doubt the truth of Lord Acton's words that "Power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely." Over these last nine years, I have had opportunities to participate in the exercise of more power than I would ever have imagined. I have felt the weight of responsibility that brings, and I have also felt the temptations attendant to it. From this perspective, I have seen the reality that people from every level and station in life desire affirmation, recognition, and fulfillment. And some go to extraordinary lengths to obtain these elusive goals. And I found early on that having a position of power doesn't bring the fulfillment that many think it does.

Of course, it does bring excitement, a sense of satisfaction when things go well, disappointment when they don't, and invitations to some of the most exclusive gatherings in the world. (For someone who likes to go to bed at 9:30 at night, that is not necessarily a plus!) But it also brings a complicated lifestyle with an exhausting schedule, innumerable headaches, and lots of conflict.

Most importantly, having a position of power does not bring inner security and fulfillment. That comes only by developing a personal relationship with God, which for me is personified by Jesus Christ. Inner security and real fulfillment comes by faith—not by wielding power in the town where power is king. As those of you believe know only too well, faith more often than not doesn't come easily. It takes work.

When I look back on my own journey of faith, I can see that real growth began when I started reading God's word as a young man. Romans 10:17 in the New Testament, says "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." The Scriptures I read also teach me that my God loves and accepts me as I am. He loves me as I struggle (and even as I fail) to become the man He wants me to be. Once upon a time, I felt I had to earn God's love, but now I know the Bible tells us that it is faith, and not works that makes us acceptable in God's sight.

In 1986, I met with a group of diplomats gathered here for this National Prayer Breakfast. One of them asked me what I felt was the most important thing I'd learned since being in Washington. I told him it was the discovery that temporal power is fleeting.

I told him about an experience I had early one morning a few years ago, when I was the White House Chief of Staff. As my driver turned the car into the Northwest gate, I looked down Pennsylvania Avenue and noticed a man walking alone. He was someone many of you would have recognized—a Chief of Staff in a previous Administration. There he was alone—no reporters, no security, no adoring public, no trappings of power—just one solitary man alone with his thoughts.

That mental picture continually serves to remind me of the impermanence of power and place. That man had it all—but only for a time. That memory puts my own life in perspective. When I leave Washington, what will remain? (One thing I know for sure—the people who wouldn't return my telephone calls before I went to Washington, won't return them after I leave.)

That fleeting aspects of power cause us to understand the importance of lasting personal relationships. Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "God evidently does not intend us all to be rich, or powerful, or great, but He intends us all to be friends." The Scriptures, both Old and New, affirm this reality by speaking about our relationships to God and to each other. The first and greatest commandment is to "Love the Lord, your God with all your heart, with all your soul, all your strength and all your mind" and the second is to "Love others as yourself." And we know too that Jesus said, "I do not call you servants, I call you friends."

These ancient thoughts on personal relationships—friendships—are often not taken seriously enough in our modern, busy lives. In all candor, I used to think that if you were strong you didn't need anyone. Too often, independence—self reliance—are said to be the path to success. And to many, being "successful," means never admitting that you have any hurts or problems. The truth is, we really do need one another if we are going to make it through this life in both our private and public capacities.

I remember a situation a few years ago where I was really struggling with a specific problem. No matter how much I tried, I couldn't figure it out—but I found strength in being able to talk it over with my wife, Susan. As we did, a truth from the book of proverbs finally crystallized our thinking.

"Trust in the Lord with all your heart, lean not unto your own understanding; in all your ways, acknowledge Him and he will direct your path." Susan helped me to see that I needed to stop trying to play God and really turn the matter over to Him. Without this kind of partnership, I'm convinced I would never have resolved the problem.

For several years, I have been meeting each week with a small group of men for fellowship. They are all pretty normal guys who just happen to hold positions of power and influence in Washington. Members of our group come from both of our nation's political parties and from several religious traditions.

None of us expresses himself in religious jargon—more typically our language is pretty earthy. But in our way, we're pursuing our faith through friendship. We've grown to trust each other. We talk pretty openly about our problems—and I don't just mean items on the national agenda. We support each other in our efforts to live a life of faith in a very complex and challenging environment.

There are, of course, many times when all of us need something extra from our faith and from our friendships. I remember my Mother telling me how she used to repeat the 91st Psalm every day when my Dad was a Captain in the Infantry in Europe in World War I: "A thousand shall fall

beside thee, and ten thousand at they right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee ...”

My Mother, who taught me so many of the values that give me strength today, drew much comfort from those words—and in hearing her say them, so did I. (She is still saying them as her 96th birthday approaches!)

I also remember how important friendships were during my first wife's illness. How important, for instance, that friends were there with me at her bedside during the last days. (Two of those friends are very prominent today and are both with us here at the head table this morning.) How important that friends were there for four little boys who were heartbroken, scared and confused. How important friendships were to the task that Susan and I faced several years later of putting two-families together at a very difficult time in the lives of seven children. (If any of you have ever had 3 seventh graders at one time, you understand what I mean!)

I remember how important friendships were and are to the need for support on a journey through public service. And I remember finally how important friendships were and are to the process of developing and maintaining my faith.

So, when I think back over the hills and valleys of my life, the consistent theme is the one in the 91st Psalm—“I will say unto the Lord, Thou art my hope and my stronghold; my God, in Thee will I trust.”

Faith and friendship are very important in building a community of nations. And as leaders, I think we share certain spiritual responsibilities.

Daniel Webster has said “If we work upon marble, it will perish. If we work upon brass, time will efface it. If we rear temples, they will crumble to dust.

But, if we work upon men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with the just awe of God, with love of their fellow men, we engrave something which no time can efface and which will brighten and brighten to eternity.”

We are all struck by the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. They are not all political or economic. In September of last year, I met with Eduard Shevardnadze in Wyoming. We had very productive sessions and on the last evening exchanged gifts. I gave him a pair of cowboy boots—in keeping with the Western motif of Jackson Hole. But, I received from him a far more profound and meaningful gift—an enamel picture of Jesus teaching the people. In giving me this picture he said—only half jokingly—“You see even we Communists are changing our world view.”

Could it be that a major meaning of the revolution going on in Eastern Europe is the resurgence of faith? What we seem to be seeing is the reaffirmation of the individual as a person worthy in his or her own right, with freedom to choose and the responsibility that goes along with those choices.

Vaclav Havel, the new president of Czechoslovakia, recently told his countrymen that the most important problem they were facing was a “decayed moral environment” devoid of belief, consideration, compassion,

humility and forgiveness. These values, of course, are crucial to democracy.

And it is no accident that the churches in Eastern Europe have played such an important part in political change. Despite oppression, the people of God have maintained their integrity as custodians of the faith.

I believe there is a moral and spiritual lesson for the United States in these events. We need to listen to others who are observing us. Lech Walesa made the observation that “Americans were drifting away from spiritual values as they become richer,” he said that “Sooner or later, we will have to go back to our fundamental values, back to God, the truth, the truth which is in God.” Then he made a most interesting statement, “We look to America . . . and expect from you a spiritual richness to meet the aspirations of the 20th century.”

And so, as we hail the resurgence of faith and freedom around the world, in America we must be mindful of our own responsibilities regarding faith. The United States, as a great political experiment was and continues to be a great spiritual experiment as well.

Every person who enjoys freedom has the responsibility to improve the society which assures that freedom. One way to carry out this responsibility is to pray together as we are doing this morning. Prayer by itself is a reaffirmation of that freedom and that responsibility, whether that prayer is private or communal. It is an act of free men and women who believe that their relationship to God is fundamental to preserving those freedoms. The Bible tells us, “Where the Spirit of the Lord Is, there is liberty.”

So my friends, I believe that as leaders, we can build relationships around the world rooted in trust, love and understanding. I believe we can go beyond rhetoric to discover concrete ways to express this reality—particularly in light of the Psalmist’s profound observation that “righteousness exalts a nation and sin is a reproach to any people.”

And so, as we join together in prayer this morning, let us be thankful for recently rekindled hopes for freedom in many countries, for our faith and for our friendships.

Let us pray for the strength to meet our collective spiritual responsibilities as leaders—by doing what we can to make our world a freer, better, and more peaceful place.

The Impact Of Religion On General Stonewall Jackson

Kevin Dougherty

Religion had a tremendous impact on the life of General Stonewall Jackson and his actions as a military commander. He believed that every act of man should be a religious act, and he carried this philosophy with him on the battlefield and in the camp. Constantly seeking to do God's will, Jackson always acted according to his literal interpretation of the Bible and his desire to serve God as a truly Christian soldier. This ideal is manifest in the general atmosphere of his camp, his reverence for the Sabbath, and his attribution of all his successes to God's blessings. Through an analysis of these three aspects of Jackson's wartime conduct, it is apparent that the driving force in his life was a desire to serve God, and this desire could not be subordinated to any earthly temptation.

Jackson wrote that he was "more anxious than I can express that my men should be not only good soldiers to their country, but also good soldiers of the cross.¹ To this end, he made every effort to provide his men with a Christian atmosphere in camp. He accomplished this goal through his personal example, his assistance to the Army's chaplains, and his suspension of military activities whenever possible to facilitate worship. Jackson's men constantly found him praying. He began even the most trivial duty by asking a blessing and ended all his activities by returning thanks.² Jackson's men could not help but notice this piety. In fact, Jim, Jackson's colored servant, claimed he "could always tell when a battle was near at hand by seeing the General get up a great many times in the night to pray."³ Perhaps the most colorful tale of the influence of Jackson's personal example on his men is the conversion of General Dick Ewell. Seeing Jackson deeply engrossed in prayer after a council of war, Ewell remarked that "if that is religion, I must have it."⁴ In addition to contributing to the spiritual development of men like Ewell, Jackson devoted much of his energy to assisting his chaplains. In a letter to his pastor, Reverend W.S.

¹J. William Jones, *Christ in Camp* (Atlanta: Martin and Hoyt, 1904), p. 83.

²George Henderson, *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War* (New York: Longman's, 1949), p. 45.

³Jones, p. 88.

⁴Jones, p. 97.

White of the Presbyterian Church in Lexington, Virginia, Jackson requested that "each Christian branch of the church should send into the army some of its prominent ministers, who are distinguished for their piety, talents and zeal."⁶ He assisted his chaplains in every way by regularly attending services, leading his soldiers in prayer, and playing an instrumental role in the organization of the Chaplain's Association.⁷ It was largely due to these exertions that Jackson's corps was better served with chaplains and missionaries than any other part of the Army.⁸ To further enhance the presence of the clergy in his camp, Jackson appointed Reverend Robert Dabney as his Chief of Staff. Jackson hoped that Dabney's presence might stimulate the Lord's work and make his army one "of the Loving God as well as of its country."⁹ Finally, Jackson gave his chaplains the opportunity to do their work by freeing his men from military duties in order to devote time to spiritual matters. For example, after the victory at Winchester, Jackson had his troops give thanks and ordered that,

For this purpose the troops will remain in camp to-day, suspending, as far as practicable, all military exercises, and the chaplains of the regiments will hold Divine service in their several charges at 4 o'clock P.M. to-day.¹⁰

Such consideration was greatly appreciated by his men. On 12 April 1863, one of Jackson's privates wrote home,

We are having a glorious time about now. We commenced a protracted meeting in this brigade about four days ago . . . General Jackson (God bless him) has given us the privilege to be exempt from morning's drill in order that we may attend preaching . . . We have two sermons each day and although we have no church to worship in we all sit around on the ground and listen to the sweet sound of the gospel.¹¹

In other camps, Jackson even found time to allow his men to build log chapels in which to worship.¹² All of these efforts made Jackson's camps a furor of religious activity. In fact, the revivals that eventually swept the Confederate Army apparently began in Jackson's camps in the latter part of March 1863.¹³ Thus, Jackson's philosophy that a man should carry his religion into all aspects of his life is extremely obvious in the way he chose to run his camps.

Jackson's literal interpretation of the Bible provided him with a strict injunction to keep holy the Sabbath. His adherence to this commandment was so unbending that he would never even read or post a letter on the Lord's Day. In fact, he considered government mail delivery on Sunday to be a violation of Divine Law, and he energetically fought to have Congress

⁵Jones, p. 98.

⁶Burke Davis, *They Called Him Stonewall* (New York: Rinehart, 1954), p. 394.

⁷Jones, p. 93.

⁸Jones, p. 94.

⁹Frank Vandiver, *Mighty Stonewall* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), p. 218.

¹⁰Jones, p. 92.

¹¹Bell Irvin Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1943), p. 180.

¹²Vandiver, p. 446.

¹³Wiley, p. 180.

suppress such traffic.¹⁴ He blamed the failure of an expedition to destroy a canal leading to Washington on the fact that the Sabbath had been trespassed upon needlessly, and he later refused to use ammunition that had been procured on a Sunday.¹⁵ Perhaps the most telling example of the conflict between Jackson's reverence for the Sabbath and the emergencies of war is the Battle of Kernstown fought on Sunday, 23 March 1862. Outnumbered almost two to one, Jackson had to attack General James Shield in order to draw General Nathaniel Banks back to the Shenandoah Valley and prevent his joining General George McClellan in a concentration against Richmond. Under such circumstances, timely action was a necessity. Jackson simply could not delay and still accomplish his mission. He decided, after much consternation and prayer, that the situation justified his breaking the Sabbath.¹⁶ Jackson knew the Sabbath was "made for man, and not man for the Sabbath", but his decision was still not an easy one.¹⁷ It was especially troublesome to Jackson's wife, Anna. In an effort to calm her fears and explain his actions, Jackson wrote,

You appear much concerned at my attacking on Sunday. I was greatly concerned too, but I felt it my duty to do it, in consideration of the ruinous effects that might result from postponing the battle until the morning. So far as I can see, my course was a wise one; the best that I could do under the circumstances, though very distasteful to my feelings; and I hope and pray to our Heavenly Father that I may never again be circumstanced on that day.¹⁸

Frank Vandiver, Jackson's excellent biographer, notes that for Jackson, "The Lord would be the ultimate judge; if He forgave the sinning soldier, He would grant victory. The issue was, as always, in God's hands."¹⁹ Jackson himself appears to believe that he was justified in God's eyes when he wrote "had I fought that battle on Monday instead of Sunday, I fear our cause would have suffered; whereas, as things turned out, I consider our cause gained much from the engagement."²⁰ However, Jackson refused to make a habit of such activity on the Sabbath. When at all possible he made Sunday a day of rest. He even went as far as to delay his march to join General Robert E. Lee at Richmond prior to the Seven Days Battle until 0100 Monday, 23 June 1862 in order to avoid breaking the Sabbath.²¹ Thus, it is readily apparent that Jackson's religious nature, manifested in his reverence for the Sabbath, greatly impacted on his command decisions.

The final, and perhaps most noble, of all the ways religion influenced Jackson is in his self-abnegation and thankfulness. In the Old Testament narrative of Joshua's battle with the Amalekites, Jackson found the Biblical formula for making official reports. Such statements were to be

¹⁴Henderson, p. 46.

¹⁵Margaret Preston, "Jackson Keeps the Sabbath" in *A Civil War Treasury of Tales, Legends, and Folklore*, ed. B. A. Botkin (New York: Promontory, 1960), p. 34.

¹⁶This description of the circumstances at Kernstown has been paraphrased from Jean Fitz, *Stonewall* (New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1979), p. 82.

¹⁷Mark 2:27.

¹⁸Davis, p. 172.

¹⁹Vandiver, p. 205.

²⁰Davis, p. 172.

²¹Davis, p. 204.

brief, fair, and modest, and, above all, were to trace victory to its proper source—God.²² Examples of Jackson's implementation of this prescription are many. To the Secretary of War, he wrote that Winchester was won "through the blessing of God."²³ To his wife, he gave thanks that during Port Republic God had "thrown His shield over me in the various apparent dangers to which I have been exposed."²⁴ To General Lee, Jackson reported after Cedar Mountain that "God blessed our arms with another victory."²⁵ To General Ewell after the Valley Campaign, he said, "he who does not see the hand of God in this is blind, sir, blind!"²⁶ And after Second Manassas, when one of his men said "We have won this battle by the hardest kind of fighting," Jackson corrected, "No. No' we have won it by the blessing of the Almighty God."²⁷ Accurately surmising such self-abnegation, Reverend Ewing observed that Jackson "seemed to feel more than any man I ever knew the danger of robbing God of the glory due for our successes."²⁸ In fact, Jackson himself said that,

Without God's blessing I look for no success, and for every success my prayer is that, all the glory may be given unto Him to whom it is properly due.²⁹

Obviously, Jackson's religion curbed his ambition and kept him from vainglory and the defensive self-centeredness that plagued so many of his contemporaries. Thus, religion, this time in the form of his relegation of all glory to God, once again influenced Jackson's conduct during the Civil War.

These three aspects of General Jackson's behavior—the atmosphere of his camp, his reverence for the Sabbath, and his pious self-abnegation—all indicate that religion did in fact enter every phase of this great man's life. Jackson was truly a "Christian soldier."³⁰ He approached his faith with the same discipline, intensity, and sacrifice that, in its military application, brought him victories on the battlefield. The noted Confederate Chaplain J. William Jones concludes that,

Jackson took Jesus as his savior, his guide, his great exemplar, "the captain of his salvation," whom he followed with the unquestioning obedience of the true soldier.³¹

It was this "unquestioning obedience" that led Jackson to do every act in the Lord's name. With such an attitude, General Jackson was inevitably influenced by religion in his life and in his actions as a military commander.

²²Jones, pp. 99–100.

²³Vandiver, p. 190.

²⁴Vandiver, p. 286.

²⁵Vandiver, p. 344.

²⁶Fritz, p. 97.

²⁷Davis, p. 303.

²⁸Vandiver, p. 333.

²⁹Vandiver, p. 334.

³⁰Vandiver, p. 30.

³¹Jones, p. 101.

Bibliography

- Davis, Burke. *They Called Him Stonewall*. New York: Rinehart, 1954.
- Fritz, Jean. *Stonewall*. New York: G.P. Putman's Sons, 1979.
- Henderson, George. *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War*. New York: Longman's, 1949.
- Jones, J. William. *Christ in Camp*. Atlanta: Martin and Hoyt, 1904.
- Preston, Margaret. "Jackson Keeps the Sabbath." In *A Civil War Treasury of Tales, Legends, and Folklore*. Ed. B.A. Botkin. New York: Promontory, 1960, p. 34.
- Vandiver, Frank. *Mighty Stonewall*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.
- Wiley, Bell Irvin. *The Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1943.

The Transition To Peace: Rites Of Passage

Timothy J. Kikkert

Introduction

“At the end of an era, people always search for collectibles that help keep the memories of that era alive,” said the newsman on the Armed Forces Network, as I drove to work this morning. “The twenty-five miles of ten-to twelve-foot high wall will provide the entrepreneurs and profiteers an almost limitless supply of souvenirs.”

End of an era, new world, peace breaking out, are thoughts, words and phrases that keep bubbling and percolating in American communities in Europe these days. The pace of change in Europe is faster than the time it takes for the ink to dry on this morning’s Stars and Stripes newspaper.

Concomitant with the changing political, economic, and social climate in Europe come changes in the U.S. military and its role in Europe. Or, let me say that even if the soldier’s daily routine has not changed as yet, he perceives that his role is changed, or changing, or about to change. The phrase to describe this is ‘transition to peace’.

Cuts, deactivations, redeployments, closures, stand downs, cancellations are words that are being used for the first time in Europe by American soldiers and their families.

This article is an attempt to get a handle on what this means for U.S. Army communities, especially in Germany: how to see it, how to understand it, and thereby how best to cope with these tumultuous events.

That is my focus. However, as I will discuss this further on, I think the approach of this article has implications that reach well beyond the American soldiers serving in Army units in Germany.

In addition, I will offer some concrete suggestions for leaders who will face new challenges and problems during the period of change.

The format of this article, then, is as follows: the next section, entitled Reflections gives my view of the meaning and appropriate response to all the changes, the key lying in the idea of ‘rites of passage’. This

Chaplain (CPT) Timothy J. Kikkert is battalion chaplain for the 4th Battalion 66th Regiment (Armor) in Aschaffenburg, FRG. He is endorsed by the Christian Reformed Church in America.

section intends to answer the question 'what is?' and is therefore theoretical in nature. The next section, entitled Implications offers further spin-offs from the reflections section. Finally, in the Suggestions section, concrete, simple ideas are offered for helping units through this period of change using various 'rites of passage'. This last section intends to answer the question 'how to?' and is therefore practical in nature.

Reflections

There are all kinds of information being passed around among soldiers in Germany. Information from a variety of sources, all pertaining to what is going to happen to the Army, to the Army in Europe, to their community, to their brigade, or to their battalion.

It seems to me that everybody knows in a general way what is happening namely that the Berlin Wall is crumbling, the Eastern bloc is disintegrating, and you can get a McBurger in McMoscow now. And—oh, by the way, Ortega is out of power and Noriega is out of Panama.

Therefore, the Army will be changing. It will be smaller, the U.S. Army presence in Germany will shrink, bases will close, and billets will be cleaned and locked and the key turned over to a German citizen. Unit flags and unit trophies and insignia will be polished or folded and stored away somewhere. Units whose entire history has been written in a German community will begin to write a whole new history at an Army post in the United States.

Everybody knows all this is coming. We read the newspaper, listen to the radio, and hear rumors about how this guy who works in Heidelberg knows all the inside information. The rumor mills are outproducing the German bakeries in quantity if not quality of food for thought. Everybody knows, and yet I think people lack ways and means to give understanding or meaning to the bits of information they receive. They read that maybe sixty-eight thousand soldiers will leave the Army by October 1, 1990, or that by 1994 there will be about 130,000 fewer soldiers in Germany or, much closer to home, they hear that their battalion is going to deactivate. What does it all mean? To simply say that the world of the Army is changing is unsatisfying, gives little comfort, and leaves people hanging on the next newspaper headline, hoping that someone will make it all clear or more understandable. Everybody wants a little clarity or perspective, or focus. There's an atmosphere of drifting or floating, people are waiting and feel at sea.

My idea for getting a grasp on these impending changes in the Army in general, but specifically and especially for the Army in Europe, is to view these changes as in the life cycle of a person or family. Additionally, and I think this is the key, that these changes are better understood and therefore better handled if 'rites of passage' are attached to events as they unfold.

The phrase rites of passage was first used by Arnold van Gennep in 1908 to describe ceremonies which accompany change in a person's life. Rites help usher an individual or group into a new way of life or status in life.

I think that the entire U.S. Army, but especially the U.S. Army in Europe, needs to recognize that it is not just going through change, but that it is going into a whole new era. The Army will never be the same again. Forty-five years in Europe is a large portion of the U.S. Army's entire history. The Army has never been in one place for such a long time and then begun the process of dismantling and leaving in large numbers.

So this is a transition or change, or a separation that marks an entirely new era. And I think 'rites of passage' can play a significant role in helping the U.S. Army move through this transition.

"Important events in the human life cycle—birth, maturity, marriage, death are observed by all societies in special ways that call attention to them as life crises. These rituals have two things in common. They mark the transition from one kind of life to another; and they are stressful situations in which new adjustments to other individuals must be made."¹

The events in Europe and the impending events in the U.S. Army are entirely new; they have never happened before. That is what people are saying and feeling, but then they don't know what to do with what they feel, or how to understand the separate pieces of information. This is particularly frustrating for leaders who are entrusted with the privilege and responsibility to command.

Viewing the changes as events like birth or puberty or death begins to give the much-needed context, the sought after big picture that fills in the gaps between all the bits of news. To say that the Army will never be the same is a big first step. Equally important, then, is to ceremonially or ritually recognize these changes with 'rites of passage'.

Edwin Friedman in *Generation to Generation* does an insightful and masterful job of recognizing the impact of 'rites of passage' in families and congregations. "Weddings, funerals, and the rites associated with birth and puberty are ancient in form, yet have the most modern results. 'Rites of passage' were the first human efforts to deal with modern psychotherapy's major areas of concern: change and separation. They are the first modes of therapy, and originally, as well as today, they are really family therapy."²

The change and separation in a family it seems to me, can easily be transferred and applied to a six-hundred-member battalion family.

Also, Friedman's reference to weddings and funerals already gives a hint as to who will play a key role in leading an Army unit through its rites of passage. The unit chaplain is the person uniquely qualified to do this. It is the unit chaplain, whether pastor, priest, or rabbi, who, by the very nature of his/her calling, serves as leader in the 'rites of passage'. Friedman makes the following comment about clergypersons: "At no other time do we operate so equally as priest (i.e., celebrant) and pastor. At no other time can

¹Farb, Peter, *Humankind*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

²Friedman, Edwin H. *Generation to Generation, Family Process in Church and Synagogue*, New York—The Guildford Press, 1985, pp. 162, 163.

we so effectively fulfill the pastoral part of our ministry without having to adopt modes and metaphors from outside our calling.”³

Again, regarding the key role of the chaplain in this time of change, my impression is that this is something that many intuitively and instinctively feel. Many people have been saying that as the changes begin to roll in like sea waves it will be the chaplain out there passing out life preservers and keeping everyone afloat. But, although there seems to be that same consensus, no-one seems to be able to say precisely what it is that they want the chaplain to do. What frame of reference does the chaplain have? How does the chaplain prioritize time, energy and resources? Everyone agrees that there are going to be ‘a lot of hurting people out there’. But there are always ‘a lot of hurting people out there’.

I think that this unique, never-before event calls for something other than usual. That what we have here is a special situation requiring new approaches.

I think viewing the coming events as unique, never-before, and never-to-be-repeated, much as a birth, baptism, or death, will go a long way toward giving the proper focus or perspective. Appropriate rites of passage and the chaplains’ key role, properly understood, will go a long way toward making this transitional period one of growth, development, and maturity.

Implications

There are seven implications which I want to briefly mention. To discuss each in depth would take us too far afield in some cases, and too deep into the theoretical jungle in other cases. Having said that, I do believe that each of these implications is significant and worthy of further thought and discussion. Also I think that these implications will influence how one understands or uses the suggestions which follow in the next section.

First, I think the changes coming for Army communities in Germany will affect the entire U.S. Army. This, superficially, appears to be so obvious that it need not be mentioned. Less money, smaller force, will affect everyone, of course.

However, what I want to suggest is in addition to the obvious effects. I think that, to the extent that the members of the U.S. Army in total, see the U.S. Army as a family, this whole family will go through the changes together. People who speak of the Army family, soldiers in uniform who are otherwise complete strangers, will feel an immediate bond when they are seated together in an aeroplane or waiting in a line. Therefore, I think that it won’t only be the soldiers in Germany feeling the brunt of the changes, while the soldiers in Hawaii, Japan, Colorado, and Kentucky stand somewhere in the background watching. Rather, U.S. soldiers stationed in places other than Europe could be as deeply affected by what happens in Europe as soldiers stationed in Germany. Once again, what Friedman says about the nuclear family can be applied to the Army family.

³*Ibid.*, p. 163.

“Life-cycle events have the power of some futuristic ‘transporter’ that can atomize relatives in one time gone and materialize them in another. Rites of passage are able to transcend both physical gaps and emotional gulfs. Perhaps no other aspect of family life provides better evidence that physical distance cannot be equated with emotional potential.”⁴

A second and closely related implication is that soldiers will go through these changes both individually and corporately. There will be personal problems and challenges or joys and sorrows. But there will also be unit problems and challenges, joys and sorrows.

A third and again closely related implication is that all soldiers will be affected. Generally, people think that those affected by these changes are first and foremost, and perhaps solely, those who will have to leave the Army. I propose that those who stay in the Army may well be more deeply affected than those who leave. Affected, I think, in a very positive, confidence building, self-affirming way.

Fourth, it seems evident that the changes will affect different people differently. As just mentioned, those who have to leave the Army will feel differently than someone who stays in the Army and is promoted. Therefore, different people will need different ‘rites of passage’.

Fifth, I think one would be remiss to overlook the fact that the host nation, the Federal Republic of Germany, is going through a very tumultuous, uncertain, exciting stage in its national life. I would argue that Germany as a nation, needs its own national ‘rites of passage’ in order to help usher in its new status and role in Europe.

Sixth, I think attention needs to be paid as to how many Army units sever ties to their host cities. Here again, ‘rites of passage’ may provide the environment and vehicle for a farewell that is appropriate and therapeutic for all concerned.

Seventh, the emotionally healthier the individual or unit, the better able they will be to approach the changes and separations in a creative, positive, confident manner.

Suggestions

What are some societal rites of passage? Baptism, Bar Mitzvah, confirmation, marriage, funeral. In general rites bring people together so that some new life event or change can be recognized. Woven through all rites of passage are also the following ideas.

First, that endings mark new beginnings. T.S. Eliot said, “In my end is my beginning.” Life goes on. These changes will not culminate in people falling into a black hole never to be seen or heard from again. Rites help move people toward that new beginning.

Second, that crises are not roadblocks to be overcome, but opportunities for growth, maturation and a deeper understanding of self. Rites are therapeutic.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 165.

Third, a person's faith is a footbridge providing a firm foundation or footing upon which to walk into an uncertain future. Rites point toward beliefs and transcendence.

Here, then, are five suggestions based on what I have already said.

First, give it a name. When a child is baptized, his name is stated. At a marriage, women often choose to take their husbands' family name. When a Catholic commits him/herself to holy orders, he/she takes a new name. Names like 'Reforger', 'Crested Shield', 'Team Spirit', carry a whole bundle of pictures, images and connotations. A name helps identify the event. I think there should be an Army-wide name for what is about to transpire. Certainly, way down at battalion level, there should be a name to help capture the importance and challenge of the new mission to be undertaken. Names should be as flashy, upbeat and inspirational as possible. Names should not be dry, lifeless or bureaucratic-sounding, neither should they be sarcastic or cynical. If, for example, my battalion, the Iron Knights, were going to redeploy, I would, perhaps, suggest that the S-3 name the operation 'Knight Moves Ninety' or 'Knight Train Ninety'. The goal is identity, dynamism and inspiration something to encourage loyalty, unity and a sense of mission.

Second, make it a family affair, ideally at the lowest level of authority possible. In most cases that will probably be at battalion level. People don't invite strangers to their wedding or Bar Mitzvah. When an individual or family goes through a life-arranging event, she or they want to laugh or cry, grieve or celebrate with people they know, love and trust.

Having said that, bear in mind, however that strangers do play an indispensable role in weddings, Bar Mitzvahs and funerals. For example, a wedding would be more difficult or impoverished, or even a disaster, if it weren't for the baker who did the cake, the jeweler who helped choose the appropriate rings and the tailor who made the formal attire. The point is that the battalion family will need the timely, conscientious, sensitive support of other units, the townsfolk or higher headquarters, in order to help them through these events and accompanying 'rites of passage'. However, battalions should be allowed to plan and execute by themselves.

Third, some individuals and probably also some units are already responding to what they see as inevitable events, especially individuals who perceive them to be a pink slip out of the Army, have already begun grieving. Called anticipatory grief, it can begin as early as six months before the actual event, the event being orders for an honorable discharge back to civilian life.

I think that this is the most common fear and cause for anxiety that is being experienced. We're all waiting for the axe to fall, and when it does, will I survive? Naturally, such a mood or anxious feeling of waiting and hoping to survive is not conducive to enthusiastic, creative and loyal performance. Rather, it fosters a preoccupied, inhibited, selfish atmosphere which deflates morale, results in more accidents with injury, and encourages self defeating habits such as smoking, overeating and substance abuse.

In the short term, responding to this anxious attitude of waiting for the axe to fall needs the most attention. A supportive, caring, social

environment; the strength found in faith and spirituality; talking about anger, sadness and loss; acknowledging and making real; all these will help individuals, as well as units, to fight off paralyzing anxiety, cynicism and despair.

Additionally, individuals and units need to reaffirm enduring values, beliefs and standards. This is what people do at a funeral. They recall and recognize what is true, what is right, where their hope lies. What has always been true and will endure through these uncertain times is held high and acknowledged. For soldiers there are many enduring values and standards which need to be recalled and recognized. Things such as military bearing, starchy physical fitness programs, weapons qualification. In other words, the basics. Such a renewed emphasis on the most basic soldier skills will mitigate the effects of the hospital-waiting-room syndrome.

Not only individuals, but also units, will anxiously await what they know is inevitable—deactivation or deployment. Any of the following could help make the transition a therapeutic, affirming process.

1. Designate a wall in the motor pool or a wooden fence or the side of a building on which every member of the battalion will say his farewell to Germany.

2. Make a donation to the local city government, such as planting as many young trees as there are soldiers in the unit.

3. Record on video-tape the important events, people and equipment that comprise the transition.

It should also be kept in mind that for many thousands of soldiers, the coming events will not have all the earmarks of a funeral. Many thousands of soldiers will see the coming events as an opportunity to excel. They relish the challenge. They don't have a 'hope-to-survive' mentality—they have a 'hungry-to-compete' attitude. They are good, they know they are good, and they see the coming tumult as opportunity to prove it.

Consoling the grievors must not lead to neglect of the achievers.

For the achievers, the coming events will be like initiates going through their passage to manhood or maturity, or warrior status. They will go out each day and prove that they are the best. These soldiers need to be recognized and accorded the respect or status that they have earned. Everyone agrees that the Army wants to keep the best soldiers. There also seems to be a consensus that the Army doesn't do that very well. One way to help keep the good soldier is to recognize and celebrate one's achievements. That can be done with cookouts, dances, laughter, celebration, and a little ribbon or medal pinned on the uniform.

Finally, my suggestion for a battalion chaplain serving in Germany is the following:

1. Go to your library, pull out a few sociology or anthropology books and read about rites of passage.

2. Go to your office, close the door, put your feet up on the desk, put a legal pad on your lap and reflect on 'rites of passage' in which you participated.

3. Go to your battalion commander and spend an hour getting a feel for his needs, worries and goals. Having done this, you will have made a

good start at helping your soldiers—your battalion family—through their rites of passage.

Conclusion

I decided not to offer a lot of specific and detailed 'rites of passage' in this article. The suggestions section gave some hints and I hope will spark a bunch of ideas. I chose not to be too specific, because, much like planning a funeral or wedding, each family has to do it for themselves. Think of how many kinds of weddings there are a catered, formal, classical affair to the simplicity of blue jeans with a guitar in a garden. We all grieve a little differently. A medical company in Frankfurt will grieve and celebrate differently than a tank battalion in Bamberg. Healthy units will go through this and come out healthier; sick units will get sicker.

I also think that rites of passage will occur regardless of whether anybody plans, notices or cares. There will be ritual toasting with crystal wine glasses, and there will be drunken beer orgies. There will be salutes and parades, and lowering of colors, all given religious sanction by prayers, benedictions and readings from the Bible. I think that if these changes and accompanying rites of passage are seen from the point of view taken by this article, the U.S. Army will be a healthier Army family as a result.

References

- Farb, Peter, *Humankind*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.
Friedman, Edwin H., *Generation to Generation: Family Process in Church and Synagogue*, New York: The Guildford Press, 1985.

Passing Over Jordan

Donald W. Gover

Editor's Note: Each year, as an integral part of the U.S. Army's Chief of Chaplains Annual Unit Ministry Team Training, a memorial service is conducted for Unit Ministry Team members who have died in the preceding year. This past year's service began with a bugle church call and prelude by the Continental Army Band ensemble. Special music was provided by Sylvia Tynes. The service included poetry, scripture reading, prayers, and the roll call. Chaplain (Colonel) Donald W. Gover, Army Material Command Chaplain, brought the following memorial sermon.

In the third and fourth chapters of the book of Joshua we have a compelling story of miraculous intervention on the behalf of God's people and the requirement to memorialize that event.

The children of Israel are commanded to cross the flooded Jordan into the promised land.

The priests are commanded to go before with the Ark of the Covenant and to stand in the midst of the water—and God would make a way.

It was to be done, the scriptures say, so that . . .

“Hereby, you shall know that the Living God is among you . . .”

And as the priest stepped into the water . . . God dried up the river.

With the priest holding aloft the Ark containing the sacred things of God . . .

The children of Israel crossed safely over Jordan opposite Jericho.

Joshua then commanded that a representative from each of the twelve tribes of Israel take a stone from the midst of the Jordan and carry it to the campsite at Gilgal where a memorial is to be constructed.

And Joshua said to them . . .

“When your children ask their fathers, in time to come, what mean these stones? . . . You can tell them that the waters of the Jordan were cut off before the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord . . . so these stones shall be to the people of Israel a memorial forever.”

We are called today to remember Unit Ministry Team members who have been faithful servants of the Lord and who have—through their lives and deaths—pointed the way for us to the promised land.

And we need to be called to remember because we have a tendency to forget—

Those who have paved the way for us.

Those who have stood in the midst of the waters.

Those who had the courage to step into the flood.

Those who held aloft for us the sacred things of God . . .

That we might cross over.

And God knows our forgetfulness.

As I studied the scriptures I was struck by the number of times God commanded that stones be gathered and memorials be built to remind His people of either a significant event or a great life lived.

It occurred to me that there is a simple but profound truth here—

That we have a tendency to forget lives and acts that we should memorialize . . .

To forget those that have had the faith and courage to step into the flood for us.

To forget those who taught us how to hold aloft the sacred things of God.

To forget those who drew us into the circle and—in time—passed the sacred things to us.

God knows and bears witness to our forgetfulness and commands us to build memorials so that—when people ask—we can testify as to what means these stones.

Yes—we have a tendency to forget the decisive interventions of God or others in our lives . . .

Perhaps it is our own egos

Or the sin of self-sufficiency

Or, simply, as one young chaplain once said—

“The senility of seniority.”

Wish I could remember the name of that young chaplain . . .

Oh, but we have a powerful need to remember—and be remembered . . .

During a lull between the charges at the second Battle of Cold Harbor in June 1864—the only battle General Grant said he regretted fighting—officers going through the Union ranks saw the men . . .

Sitting on the grass under the trees, or in the thickets

Sewing their names on their sleeves/

They expected to die in the ensuing charge and shrank from the oblivion of a nameless grave . . .

They wanted someone in the—

Hills of western Pennsylvania,

The forest of Vermont or Wisconsin,

Or the cities of New York to know how and when they had died,

And where their bodies rested . . .

Someone to know their name.

Yes—the human heart wants to know if there is—

An ear to hear

Or an eye to witness,

Its struggles, sorrows and pain,

Or the meaning of a life nobly lived.

Each of us hungers for recognition of the contributions of our lives.

What troubles me is how soon we forget those who have served our regiment before us.

Those who stepped into the flood.

Those who held aloft the sacred things of God.

Those who—before us—through courage and faith, held back
the flood-tide of sin and despair so that soldiers and their
families could safely . . . pass over Jordan.

We must not forget them. The ungrateful heart is an abomination to God.

We must not forget that we are surrounded by—as the scriptures say—a
“great cloud of witness.”

Witnesses who can teach and encourage and inspire.

Witnesses who bear the stripes and scars of sacrificial lives.

Witnesses who we need—even now—to show us the way over Jordan.

We forget that some day we—ourselves—will be among the cloud of
witnesses—

Tired perhaps,

Old perhaps.

But still proud of our service in the regiment.

It's easy to forget how suddenly that times comes.

General Bernard Rogers—past Chief of Staff of the Army and SHAPE
Commander—commented after his retirement that the transition to a has-
been is sudden and final.

He spoke about the long climb up the promotion ladder from lieutenant to
four star rank and the top Army job—and then—soon after retirement going
out and getting into the right hand side of his sedan.

And the car went nowhere.

We often forget that we will not always be active members of the regiment.

I have developed over the past few years a practice I commend to you. I
keep a list of chaplains and chaplain assistants who have retired . . .
members of the regiment who have—

Trained me,

Cared for me,

Inspired and loved me.

I try—about once a year—to call them and keep our relationship alive.

It seems to mean so much that someone in the regiment remembers and
cares. And they miss the regiment and the Army . . .

The bugle calls for reveille and retreat.

The cadence calls and the in unison foot-strike sound of the morning run.

The soldiers—always the soldiers.

I have recently contacted Huey Bridgman—retired and working for the Army at Fort Benning, Georgia. Huey trained me, mentored me and challenged me and I—in time—reaped far more benefit from his efforts than he did. I owe him greatly.

John Snider, an old and dear friend of mine—and many of you as well—retired from White Sands Missile Range last June. John—an incredibly skilled chaplain and pastor—is now pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Taos, New Mexico. I keep in touch.

I talked recently with John Durham who retired in the early eighties. John was a special kind of friend to me and to hundreds of other chaplains and chaplain assistants. John now works on a prison staff in Buena Vista, Colorado. I told him—"I always knew you would one day wind up behind bars,"—and that raucous laugh that I remember so well echoes across the miles.

I must . . . be tied to the past and to those who have created my present.

We need to remember . . .

Lives and deeds of yesterday.

The meaning of these stones.

People who—as one writer has said—

Never look to the past in gratitude,

With a heart that proclaims that God—

and our fellow servants—have brought us

us safely this far,

will find that the future will not be apt to look back to them with appreciation.

All of us can recall the quotation of Santyana—

If we do not learn from the past, we are

doomed to repeat it.

In one sense the phrase is somewhat negative and cynical—I would like to rephrase it . . .

Let us learn from the past—

So that we might repeat it . . .

Repeat the powerful examples of courage and faith we have witnessed.

Repeat the courage and dedication of those who stood in the flood.

Replicate the holding aloft of the sacred things of God so others can pass over dry ground.

By remembering, we honor ourselves as well as those who have passed the Ark to us . . .

By remembering—comrades and friends of our regiment—we can witness to the meaning of these stones . . .

By remembering, we can summon up the faith and courage to test the waters for others . . .

By remembering, we can fulfill our mission to the soldiers and family members—and all others we serve—so that they may safely pass over Jordan.

God help us to remember . . . as we pass over Jordan

Roll Call of Deceased Members

Chaplain (BG) Ned Graves, U.S. Army (Retired)

Chaplain (Colonel) Harold E. Nunemaker, U.S. Army (Retired)

Chaplain (Colonel) John J. Kowsky, U.S. Army (Retired)

Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) Samuel Lewis, U.S. Army (Retired)

Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) James E. Morris U.S. Army (Retired)

Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) William F. Pletcher, Jr., U.S. Army (Retired)

Chaplain (Major) Thomas M. Carroll, U.S. Army Reserve

Sergeant Robert Litz, Chaplain Assistant, U.S. Army

Specialist Bradley Sherry, Chaplain Assistant, U.S. Army

Book Reviews

War No More? Options in Nuclear Ethics

James W. Walters, Ed.

Fortress Press, 1989. Paper, 115 pages

The idea for this volume grew out of a 1986 conference on nuclear arms held at Loma Linda University. The five major contributors include: John H. Yoder, Mennonite pacifist theologian and author of a dozen books; Paul Seabury, author and former member of President Reagan's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board; and the Roman Catholic theologian George Weigel, author and president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center.

The fundamental question of this volume is: What view of war is fundamentally Christian? As is typical of publications associated with the Loma Linda University Ethics Center, it does not seek to provide an answer. Rather, it attempts to clarify issues. It addresses the three main Christian positions on war in the United States: Christian Pacifism, Just War and Just Nuclear Defense. The final two essays comment on the three positions previously presented.

Yoder is most helpful to me in pointing out that there may be many situations in which the taking of human life is justified, yet none of these justify war. I appreciate his succinct critique of the just war position which appeals to me. Seabury challenges when he asks if Christ's followers today have a ministry of reconciliation which extends into the sociopolitical arena of the superpowers. In light of recent events in Eastern Europe, Bennett almost seems prescient in his comment on the many forms of communism.

Those who are looking for a Christian approach to war grounded in theological idealism will find this volume valuable. I look beyond idealism to a pragmatic application in the real world. For this aspect I find the seminal 1983 publication *Living With Nuclear Weapons* by the Harvard Nuclear Study Group to be very helpful.

Read the book, it will challenge you. But, it will not provide answers to all of your questions.

Chaplain (MAJ) Temple G. Matthews III
U.S. Army

Moral Issues in Military Decision Making

Anthony E. Hartle

University of Kansas Press, 1989. Hardcover, 180 pages, \$25.00

Colonel Anthony Hartle is the professor of philosophy and a member of the permanent faculty at the United States Military Academy at West Point. He has served tours of duty in Southeast Asia and was decorated for valor. He commanded an infantry battalion in the 101st Airborne Division, and currently is a member of the Executive Board of the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics.

Colonel Anthony E. Hartle has done us a great service with this splendid discussion of the American professional military ethic. Books like this volume have more value to us than any code of ethics possibly could, because it forces us to think through the role of the military in American society and to raise questions about how that role brings with it obligations to act in certain ways. It is only when we struggle with those roles and obligations are we able to articulate a professional ethic.

Colonel Hartle begins with a quote from Michael Walzer, "*For war is the hardest place: if comprehensive and consistent moral judgments are possible there, they are possible everywhere.*" Given the complexity of the modern battlefield, the elaborate array of powerful weapons and the authority of the military commander to place persons in great danger, trying to sort through the complex issues of professional military ethics is a necessary task. The turbulence of the last twenty-five years, the behaviors of North and Poindexter, and the restructuring of the military, makes examining professional military ethics an urgent responsibility.

Colonel Hartle examines the military as a profession, the nature of professional ethics, the moral character of the laws of war, and the constitutional values of American society. He establishes a theoretical perspective on what makes the American experience of soldiering a unique experience producing a unique professional military ethic. He makes his case with clarity and coherence. When he finishes you have a concise framework from which to analyze "right deliberate choices" commanders and soldiers are asked to make.

He concludes with a series of case studies and discussions of these causes which are of great value. These are especially valuable to chaplains who are asked to advise the commander on ethics and morals. Chaplains should read this book and discuss it among themselves and with their commanders. Colonel Hartle provides great material for professional development in professional ethics.

Chaplain (Colonel) Herman Keizer, Jr.
U.S. Army

**Making Friends of Enemies:
Reflections on the teachings of Jesus**

Jim Forest

The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1988. Hardcover, 112 pages, \$12.95

Jim Forest is communications secretary of the International Fellowship of reconciliation, located in the Netherlands, with branches around the world. His published books include *Love Is the Measure: A Biography of Dorothy Day* and *Thomas Merton*.

In a world filled with loneliness and fear, the author invites the reader to take the risk of love and open the door to let his or her life be transformed by God's love.

What does it really mean to love our enemies? Who is my enemy? What does it mean to love? In the first half of the book, Forest offers insights and inspiration on these questions through the teachings and parables of Jesus in the Gospels. For Forest, Jesus' miracle of turning water into wine at Cana is significant in that he can also turn enmity into love.

In the second half of the book, the author provides some convincing practical helps in breaking down barriers of fear and enmity and making friends between individuals, groups, and nations. In a sermon-like narrative, Forest offers many valuable illustrations from recent historical figures and events as well as from the life and teachings of Jesus to make his plea interesting and persuasive.

Citing that a love characterized by action and responsibility is the only solution to our fears, he gives an impression that he himself is a non-violence advocator and a conscientious objector. "Perfect love casts out fear."

This book should be a definite asset to the library of any minister for the sheer number of valuable illustrations on such important subjects as forgiveness and love. Especially valuable is this book to the military chaplain for its insights on non-violence and conscientious objection. But more importantly, it will help the reader experience the spiritual liberation that comes from turning fear into peace through the power of love.

Chaplain (CPT) Paul P. Buck
U.S. Army

**Justice, And Only Justice
A Palestinian Theology of Liberation**

Naim Stifan Ateek

Orbis Books, Maryknoll, N.Y. 1989. Hardcover, 188 pages plus 25 pages of footnotes

Naim Ateek by his own definition is a Christian, a Palestinian, an Arab, an Israeli, and an Episcopalian clergyman. This description also sets out his life's priorities. Out of these apparent contradictions, he presents a call for peace in his homeland.

Rev. Ateek is the son of a leader of the Palestinian community before the Zionists reconquest of Israel in 1948. Instead of fleeing as a lot of their neighbors did, the Ateeks' choose to remain in their home and learn to live in the new nation. Like many who strayed they were forced to move as refugees.

While Rev. Ateek was in the United States completing his seminary education, his father died. Rev. Ateek returned to his homeland in 1966 to begin his ministry among his people.

This book is an unashamably Christian call for dialogue between the conflicting parties in Israel. The foundation of his book is the Biblical call to justice. "Justice and only justice, you shall follow that you might inherit the land which the Lord your God gives you." (Deuteronomy 16:20).

The book begins with a detailed account of the various currents of thought in politics and religion from the early 1800's through the formation of a Jewish state in 1948 to the present situation. Most significant is his account of the subduing of the land and its people by the Jewish government. This account in itself makes the book valuable and calls us from complacency to concern.

Many questions are raised that will probably not be answered in our life time. The horrors of the Holocaust can *never* be ignored or diminished. However, Rev. Ateek asks, is this justification for the Jews to treat the Palestinian inhabitants of the land in a similar manner? Does suspension of their right to patriotic expression give approval to treat all non Jews living in the land as less than human? This in turn only recreates a situation like the Jews suffered under the hands of the Nazi.

Rev. Ateek's challenge is that peace can only be achieved when all people are treated with justice and equity. The second half of the book is taken up with this discussion. He grounds this solidly in a Christian theology and to set the stage for dialogue within the Jewish and Arabic community many of his references are from the Jewish Scriptures and other Jewish leaders and their writings.

The author concludes with a proposed strategy for the church and a discussion on implementation of this in the church and the Middle East community. This book is excellent in making us aware of the situation with facts often overlooked by the press. Rev. Ateek does a superbly thorough job of setting forth a theology that presents God's Word to a people caught in tragedy. This book helps us to better grasp the Middle East dilemma.

Chaplain (CPT) David Scharff
U.S. Army

The Other Side of Time: A Combat Surgeon in World War II

Brendon Phibbs

Pocket Books 1987, 341 pages, \$4.50

Dr. Brendon Phibbs is a surgeon who was educated at Northwestern University and St. Luke's Hospital. Dr. Phibbs recalls his experiences as a

combat surgeon assigned to a combat command of the 12th Armored Division in World War II. He deals with the persons who he met, trained with, fought with, and who also died in the fighting across Europe.

This book is not just a collection of stories. It has consistency, and an even flow from start to finish. It is based on notes the author wrote during the war on whatever paper was available, and stored for 35 years, until he was ready to deal with the memories to be unleashed.

Dr. Phibbs deals with the incompetence and the unconcern of rear area headquarters soldiers for the combat soldier both in training and in combat. He also deals with the heroism and inadequacy of the combat soldiers as they deal with the enemy and inadequate equipment.

This book deals with the pain of combat, the hours of reflection, the feelings of inadequacy in the face of slaughter and damaged bodies, along with the interludes of pleasantness. Dr. Phibbs presents all of this in a easy to read, pleasant style. He slips in points of poignancy and education amid the description of training and combat.

The author has some negative comments to say about chaplains in chapter 10. Dr. Phibbs feels that the chaplains of his division did not go out of their way to be helpful to most of the soldiers, but would spend most of their time with senior officers. The career officer was plentiful, the true pastor was infrequent.

This book is worth reading for the experiences of the combat surgeon as he deals with the fear, pain, joy, of being in a combat division. It is worth while because it is a reminder of why we should be alert to what we are about and how we should go about our calling.

Chaplain (CPT) Thomas C. Condry
U.S. Army

When Your Spouse Dies:

A concise and practical source of help and advice

Cathleen L. Curry

Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1990. Softcover, 127 pages, \$5.95

Fifteen months after the death of my spouse this slim volume was given me for review. Having heard and read Kubler-Ross, having taught or discussed her theory many times, and having directed several types of growth and support groups, I thought my grief was dealt with and passed. But as I read Curry's book, the realization came that God was not finished with me yet—tears began to build, my gut began to churn, and I found myself quietly weeping while reading the book through.

Curry's slim volume describes her husband's unexpected death of a heart attack after 22 years of marriage, leaving her with nine children from 19 to 2 years of age. She chronicles her own journey through the next twenty years with its emotional and spiritual roller coaster. Working through the grieving process with family, friends, and spiritual advisors, led her to return to college for a degree completion program and then to work

professionally in assisting others through the same process. Curry's story is a marvelous personal testament of faith development in which she underlines the importance of the life of the spirit and healthy interpersonal relationships in healing. Particularly moving is her admiring description through Roman Catholic lenses of the Jewish grieving ritual. The book also includes a helpful bibliography which Curry uses in her professional work.

I shall read this wonderful little book a couple more times for myself; then I will pass it on to a friend whose spouse recently died.

Chaplain (COL) Billy Libby
U.S. Army

JESUS 2000

Richard Bauckham, et al., Consulting Editor

Batavia, IL: Lion Publishing Corporation, 1989. Hardcover, 239 pages, no price listed

For several years I have been reading the recent research and writings broadly called "the Jesus material." Those documents include scholarly research by Jewish and Christian scholars into the events of Jesus' life and his work with his disciples as well as the Jewish origins of Christianity and the early development of Christian cells in the first and second century synagogues. The volume JESUS 2000 caught my attention but reading the book became a rather strange adventure.

The content of this 238 page, coffee-table size volume is excellent—a popular-style, articulate, synthesis of the latest in research and interpretation. The book could be well used by clergy and laity to catch up on the recent writings. The pictures of everyday contemporary life around the world are worth the price of the volume; they are marvelous photographs printed well, both in black and white and color. Part 6, dealing with contemporary Christianity and its place in the world, is lucid and articulate while representing the generally conservative views of the editors; the final pages called "The Finality of Jesus" could prove to be offensive to some who represent other faith groups.

The book has several shortcomings for the person who wants to read more seriously. First, the chapters and subsections are written by thirty persons representing eight countries who are identified in a list of contributors near the front of the volume. However, neither the Table of Contents nor the actual chapter headings list authors. Learning who wrote a specific section means a confusing hunt through the contributor's list to find the author. Second, though several scholars and books are mentioned in the text or in the short Index, the volume has no bibliography of any sort. Finding suggestions for follow-on readings means looking elsewhere.

Given the above shortcomings, the book is worthwhile—though not for all. Persons of other faith groups interested in learning more about Christianity and the New Testament could use the volume as a popular style, general introduction. Protestant and Roman Catholic catechumens would

probably learn much from the volume, as would young people excited by contemporary style writing. Its real value is for Christian laity and clergy interested in general background reading and study.

Chaplain (COL) Billy Libby
U.S. Army

**The Painful Field:
The Psychiatric Dimension of Modern War**

Richard A. Gabriel

Greenwood Press, 1988. Hardcover, 187 pages, \$39.95

Richard Gabriel is Professor of Political Science at Anselm College and well-known writer in the field of contemporary military affairs.

Painful Field is Number 75 in the Greenwood Press Contributions in Military Studies series. Gabriel's topics include the madness and horror of war throughout history, the destructive capability of modern weapons, the development, use and contrasts of Soviet and U.S. military psychiatry, and a projection of the future for military psychiatry.

The first third of the book is the most valuable for religious support providers. Gabriel presents graphic descriptions of physical and emotional battlefield destruction. His initial assertion is this: "to understand modern conventional war is to recognize a single, indisputable fact: war is not only becoming more lethal in terms of its ability to kill and to maim, it is far more destructive in its ability to drive soldiers mad." (p. 17) He says that "as we improve the technology of killing arithmetically, the power to drive combatants crazy, to debilitate them through fear and mental collapse, is growing." (p. 17)

Gabriel supports his assertions with historical research showing that fear and madness have been companions for soldiers throughout history. His presentation of modern warfare shows clearly that the modern weapons surpass the ability of humans to endure emotionally. He relies on manufacturers weapon specifications to show the capabilities.

He discusses ways armies have tried to control fear and prevent battle stress. These include religious services, blessings, drugs and alcoholic beverages. In his discussion he says, "what these attempts to prevent battle stress have in common is the fact that they have not succeeded very well simply because a soldier's character has very little to do with his ability to endure the stress of battle." (p. 122) The UMT is very much in the business of character enhancement. This statement by Gabriel is one for the UMT to consider seriously. His point is that the objective conditions of battle to which a soldier is exposed are much more critical in determining performance and survivability.

Perhaps Gabriel misses the point of these events. He sees them as attempts to *prevent* battle stress. In fact, all soldiers will experience stress. I think the UMT will support soldiers in an effort to help them *cope* with the stress and not all become battle fatigue casualties. Religious support such as

the services or blessings certainly is not going to prevent natural fear. It will, I continue to hope, help soldiers cope with the fear, terror and stress of battle. Battle causes soldiers to face the ultimate questions of life around meaning, death, relationship with a Divine Being, etc. This is the territory of the UMT. Hopefully we can continue to find ways to show the effectiveness and value of religious support. Doing so will enhance our ability to assist soldiers survive, cope with, and recover from, the horrors of tragedy and war. A secondary gain of such research may be strengthening the future of the chaplaincy in the face of force structure changes.

Gabriel's focus is to show the horror of war and the history of military psychiatry. He does both well. *Painful Field* will add considerably to any discussion of the harsh reality of war's effects on soldiers and the efforts of mental health personnel to help them cope. Serious consideration of a book like this increases the possibility that the UMT can make a difference to the soldiers whom they serve.

Chaplain (MAJ) Kenneth M. Rupp
U.S. Army

Thank You Therapy: The Cure For Anxiety

Don Baker

Victor Books, 1989. Hardcover, 119 pages, \$10.95

Dr. Don Baker is a successful pastor, serving churches in California, Oregon, and Illinois for 38 years. He currently is Minister-at-large for the Conservative Baptist Association of America traveling extensively ministering to pastors, churches and missionaries. Best selling books written by Dr. Baker include *A Fresh New Look at God*, *Lord I've Got a Problem*, and *Love: A New Look at an Old Word*.

While anxiety is clearly prevalent in our society, understanding and dealing with it well are not. This book presents a practical and profound plan for the cure of anxiety based upon St. Paul's advice to believer's in Philippians 4:6-7.

Avoiding the simplistic, "pat-answer" type of approach, the author defines anxiety as a spiritual problem with physical and psychological symptoms. "Anxiety left unchecked and uncontrolled is raw unbelief. It is fear that refuses to respond to faith. . . . It is unwillingness or inability to allow the abiding presence of an all-powerful God to take charge of any distressing circumstance in life (p. 15). The spiritual cure for anxiety is the kind of praying taught in Philippians 4:6-7. He calls it Thank-You Therapy.

St. Paul's prescription for anxiety has three essential ingredients: Be anxious for nothing, Be prayerful for everything, Be thankful for anything. First, learn to recognize anxiety and acknowledge that it is unbelief. The Second, express worship and specific petition in prayer, transferring our concern to God. Finally, thanksgiving is the catalyst that makes the process operative.

Our Thank-You to God is a giant step of faith, expressing our unwavering confidence in Him, which is His ultimate objective for us.

Biblical and present-day personal accounts, illustrate how this prescription is put into practice. The purpose is not to change circumstances but to change attitudes. "Thank-You Therapy is not a psychological tool designed to lessen the impact of life's problems; it's a spiritual truth determined to refocus our attention. . . . It's not life's circumstances that create anxiety; it's our own responses to them" (p. 40). This refocus of attention to God enables us to act on His promises rather than our feelings. And it enables us to trust Him for the unknown.

This readable book is an extremely valuable resource. The friendly, down-to-earth style of Dr. Baker makes it appropriate to give directly to those struggling with anxiety. At the same time, the depth of the concepts presented make it a useful manual for the pastoral counselor. The inclusion of numerous illustrations gives life to the theories discussed.

Chaplain (MAJ) Nicholas D. Bell
U.S. Army

Intercultural Marriage: Promises and Pitfalls

Dugan Romano

International Press, Inc., Yarmouth, Maine, 1988, 162 pages, \$14.95 plus \$1.50 for postage/handling

This book should be read and a copy of it should be kept in every active/reserve component library of any Chaplain who does any intercultural marriage counseling. The Armed Forces of the United States, the Army in particular, is fast becoming a global village represented by every major ethnic/cultural group in the world. What this means is that various military communities in which military chaplains serve throughout the world have to cope with these cultural marriages, their social relationships and conflicting value systems. Thus, there is stress in the lives of intercultural families and this can impact negatively upon the cosmopolitan military community, both at home and overseas.

While the book doesn't claim to cover every aspect of intercultural marriage, it is certainly a useful handbook which poses a lot of questions for consideration pertaining to intercultural marriages. At the same time it gives helpful suggestions in regard to counseling couples in such a relationship.

The book presents an overview on the types of people who marry into another culture. The author considers some of the general personality types who are likely to marry outside of his/her culture and the underlying motivations for doing so. The reasons range from economic and social factors to psychological considerations.

In any marriage there is the honeymoon stage where everything is rosy and positive. Then comes the settling-in stage. At this stage comes the nuts and bolts of the marriage and major differences begin to surface. For the intercultural couple, at this juncture, more often than not they are going through culture shock of psychological disorientation. Here the couple faces more than the usual kind of problems concerned with living in a foreign

land. They encounter problems which probably no other foreigners face. For these couples, there is no "going home".

The second part of the book brings out the trouble spots—the differences which become real issues. Mainly the differences stem from ethnic or cultural origin, and these can be complicated by differences in age, personality, social status, and educational level which are common to most marriages.

Lastly, the author zeroes in on ways of turning the differences into pluses by sorting out the issues from the love relationship and using these issues as challenges to be managed to the couple's benefit, thereby working through some of the problems they might create. From this, then, the couple begins to develop a harmonious marriage in spite of their differences in values, social customs and beliefs.

The author also discusses effectively some of the basic conditions which must exist before the marriage can begin to function well. Many of these apply to any marriage and some are specific to intercultural marriages.

Any marriage is like a serious game; but the intercultural marriage is more so because both partners come fixed with a different set of rules, come with different values, habits, and viewpoints, and each possesses different ways of relating and solving problems. Until one set of rules is agreed upon, the game doesn't work. Deciding on which (or whose) rules can be difficult and can cause misunderstanding, conflicts, or actually break open two people who love each other. Intercultural marriage is definitely not for the weak in spirit, but it is for those who are strong in commitment and who want to get around shortcomings. It is for those who can foster promises of making a good marriage even better. At this point, the pay-off of the intercultural marriage is much greater than that of marriages in which both partners are from the same culture. The intercultural marriage is far richer because of combining the two opposite cultures in a workable union.

Chaplain (LTC) Stephen K. Kim
U.S. Army

The Galilean Jewishness of Jesus:

Retrieving the Jewish Origins of Christianity

Bernard J. Lee, S.M.

Paulist Press, New York, 1988. Paperback, 158 pages

Bernard J. Lee, S.M. has done graduate work in classical languages at The Catholic University, in theology and contemporary philosophy at the University of Fribury. He has both taught and done research in Israel. His teachings and publications have dealt with ecclesiology, sacramental theology, christology, and the empirical tradition in process theology.

This book is volume one in a series called *Conversation On The Road Not Taken*. Volume two in this series of at least three will deal with metaphors about who God is and how He is present among us. Volume three will deal with asking what kind of world we will have in front of us in the latter decades of the 2nd millennium.

This volume in the series sets the stage for the remaining volumes. The author introduces himself to us. He details his educational background and philosophy. He has a heavy reliance on the process theology of Alfred North Whitehead and others. This is a highly philosophic study.

The book has three basic chapters: A Historicist Conversation, Galilean Jewishness, and Jesus the Jew and Other Jews. On page 40 we find the point of this book, in the chapter titled a Historicist Conversation:

“I will oversimplify the point of this book for a moment. Of the many New Testament metaphors that interpret Jesus christologically, one has dominated Christianity’s unfolding self understanding: the *Logos/Word* made flesh. For socio-cultural reasons, *Logos* was undoubtedly the best root metaphor for making the Christian story stand up there in front of Hellenised men and women, and calling them into discipleship. However, *Logos* is almost certainly not a metaphor in Jesus own self-understanding, as I hope to indicate. While we cannot get inside his subjectivity, we can surmise that *Logos* is not in the assumptive world of a Galilean Jew in Jesus’ time.”

Once I personally struggled through the first chapter, due to my lack of knowledge of philosophy and interest in process theology. I found I enjoyed the author’s style and content. It became an interesting, thought provoking book.

I feel this book would be a good supplemental reading book for a New Testament survey course. It gives some insight and provides areas of thought for all preachers and pastors as they seek to make the Bible come alive for their congregations.

Chaplain (CPT) Thomas C. Condry
U.S. Army

Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark’s Story of Jesus

Ched Myers

Orbis 1988. Softcover, 500 pages, \$16.95

The author of Mark was a member of a Christian community which practiced radical nonviolent resistance to oppressive social systems. Because of this, Mark’s Jesus defends the rights of those who are oppressed. This is true whether the oppression is at the hands of the Jewish temple state or the Roman imperialists.

The political situations that resulted in Mark’s gospel are explained. Military readers will find the discussion of the Jewish rebellion of 66–70 C.E. particularly intriguing. Mark’s community was caught in the middle, hating the Romans while opposing the use of force because they believed that violence was contrary to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Mark’s author was an apologist for his community. He looked to the stories of Jesus which had formed the early Christian communities in the first place. Mark chose to show how Jesus opposed the oppressive systems of his day.

This commentary is divided into two sections, based on Myers’ belief that Mark was written in two parts. In the first section, Jesus’ dealings

with Jews are discussed. These dealings take place in the first half of the book of Mark.

The second section concerns Jesus' dealings with gentiles. These occur in the second half of Mark and parallel the events in the first half of Mark. The theme of inclusiveness with regard to Jews and gentiles is stressed, probably because of a practice of inclusiveness in Mark's community.

Besides gentiles, other outcast groups are also to be treated as equals. One such group is women. This is made clear through Jesus' teachings concerning women, which are very radical for his day. One example is Jesus' opinion regarding divorce (Mark 10:11). Myers points out: "... the second clause, in which the rights of the female partner are expanded to include her right to divorce ... directly *contradicted* Jewish law, which stipulated that only men could initiate and administer such proceedings." (emphasis original)

Overall, the commentary is very well written. While I didn't always agree with the author, I always found the book to be challenging and thought provoking. Perhaps military chaplains are the ones who need to read this book the most since we can, if we're not careful, get caught up in the same kinds of imperial authority that Jesus was protesting against.

Chaplain (CPT) Grant Speece
U.S. Army

Homosexuality in History and the Scriptures: Some Historical and Biblical Perspectives on Homosexuality

Ronald M. Springett

Biblical Research Institute, [12501 Old Columbia Pike, Silver Spring, MD 20904-1608], 1988. Paper, 173 pages, \$6.95

Ronald Springett was born in London, graduated from the University of London and received B.A., M.A. and MDiv. degrees from schools in the United States. He did his doctoral work at the University of Manchester and has studied under F.F. Bruce and Barnabas Lindars. His Ph.D. is in the area of New Testament Backgrounds. He is presently teaching at Southern College in Tennessee.

Dr. Springett has attempted to analyze some of the claims of the homosexual movement in the context of a conservative approach to Scripture. He considers various definitions and proposed causes of homosexuality and examines biblical texts in their historical context.

This book is a veritable mine of information on the historical and biblical backgrounds of homosexuality. Several of the individual chapters contain close to 100 footnotes and references. It provokes questions, stimulates thought and demonstrates a clear understanding of the biblical languages.

The seven chapters cover three major areas with a final chapter for conclusions: How do we define homosexuality and what do we know about

its cause? The Old Testament texts and historical background? The New Testament texts and historical background?

Springett has not written a polemic. He is willing to make statements such as: "Regarding homosexuality itself, it is clear that no one really understands its causes, whether it is a physical, mental, or psychosocial phenomenon. [Page 153]" He challenges the church to set its house in order and suggests that it may be in a poor position to preach to gays [page 162]. In his pursuit of truth he takes a strong stand on the traditional understanding of some texts and suggests that others, both so-called pro- and anti-homosexual texts, are not really relevant at all [page 142].

This book is a must for every church leader.

Chaplain (MAJ) Temple G. Matthews III
U.S. Army

No Longer Strangers

Bishop K.H. Ting

Orbis Books, Maryknoll, N.Y. 10545, 1989. Softcover, 199 pages

Bishop K.H. Ting is Principal of the Nanjing Theological Seminary, Chairman of the Three-Self National Committee, and President of the China Christian Council, People's Republic of China. Born in 1915, he has studied in China and the United States. He holds a master's degree from the Union Theological Seminary. He has held church positions in Canada and Switzerland. Although he has travelled widely, most of his long career has been in China where his primary concern is the progress of the Protestant Church.

Bishop Ting seeks a Chinese Protestant Church that is self-supporting, self-administering, and self-propagating. He wishes to free Chinese religion from the imperialistic influence of foreign missionaries and theologians.

This brief but probing book consists of selected writings of Bishop Ting, chosen and edited by Professor of Ethics Raymond L. Whitehead of the Toronto School of Theology. For the reader whose knowledge of modern China is limited, this book presents an introduction to the problems of trying to make religion effective and meaningful in a Communist nation that is essentially atheistic. Bishop Ting indicates that his church has been able to reach an accommodation with the Communist government, which he does not regard as a threat to the growth of Christianity in China. His main attack is on western countries and institutions that he deems anti-Communist and imperialist. He states:

Feudalism, imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism long weighed like three mountains on the backs of the Chinese people. (p. 172)

Bishop Ting attests that there is freedom of religion in China. He does not mention freedom of speech. The author expresses many political opinions in this book. None would offend his government. He regards Taiwan as part of China. He opposed the Cultural Revolution and the "Gang of Four". He decries American foreign policy and its "imperialism."

Some statements of the author are difficult to analyze. For example, what do we make of his statement of page 126?

The atheists of today are lovers of humanity, ready to sacrifice everything for the welfare of their fellows. True revolutionaries are guided by strong feelings of love.

Is this an example of studied political and psychological analysis, or just another example of Christian charity? Without a greater knowledge and understanding of Bishop Ting, it is difficult to attack him, but the reader should be on guard when reading this book, which is a mixture of theology and political opinion, with a substantial anti-American content.

This book is well written and well edited. The chronological disorder is confusing but it is organized by topic which the editor deemed important.

If China is your field of interest, read this book. However, read it with caution, and fight back when necessary.

Chaplain (MAJ) Kenneth J. Leinwand
U.S. Army

Military Chaplain's Review

(USPS 590-430)

US ARMY CHAPLAINCY
SERVICES SUPPORT AGENCY

1730 K STREET NW

WASHINGTON, DC 20006-3868

SECOND CLASS MAIL

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID BY

USA CHAPLAINCY SERVICES SUPPORT

AGENCY

(USPS 590-430)

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE

\$300